LIBRARY OF
MAINE WESLEYAN SEMINARY
AND FEMALE COLLEGE

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 4.

JUNE, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COPYRIGHT, 1900.
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
32, 34 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY OF
MAINE WESLEYAN SEMINARY
AND FEMALE COLLEGE

The Forum

JUNE, 1901.

GOVERNING THE ORIENT ON WESTERN PRINCIPLES.

THE idea of endowing an inferior or backward race with the institutions of a more highly developed civilization has at present a great charm for the American people. It will, therefore, be well to inquire how far attempts to accomplish this result have been successful in the past, especially in India and other parts of the Orient brought under European influence. An inquiry of this nature, while not establishing any unyielding precedents of action, will at least tend to reveal certain circumstances which cannot well be disregarded in determining upon a policy adapted to an Oriental population. The experience of the English in India, highly suggestive in this connection, affords a remarkable example of how, in dealing with alien races, the best intentions may lead to the worst results. It is truly the land of deceived hopes, the "land of regrets," and every reader of Kipling's Indian stories will instinctively feel the nature of these disappointments. The British have succeeded to a noteworthy degree in giving India peace and material prosperity, but any hopes that were entertained for achievements beyond this have been thwarted. The ideal of Wilberforce and Macaulay, that the populations of the Orient should be led, through education and representative government, toward the progressive civilization of the West, has encountered the dogged opposition of a static society. Since the day of these men the Government has confined its efforts entirely to a policy of maintaining peace and fostering material development, in other respects leaving the customs and institutions of the natives very much as they formerly were.

Permission to republish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In matters of religion the policy of the Government has been one of perfect neutrality. Originally, missionary work was not even permitted in India. Later, during the first half of the nineteenth century, the Government fostered and protected the ceremonies of the native religions. But during the last decades all interference on the part of the Government has been discontinued. The rites and endowments of the native religions are administered exclusively by the native priesthood.

Among the three great religions of India, Brahmanism is the most comprehensive system of belief. Whatever may be the character of worship, whether it be an idealization of humanity or a primitive fetichism, it is readily received into this pantheon, as a manifestation of the same homage of mankind for the idea. But, in proportion as this religion is broad and tolerant toward forms of belief, so is it narrow in respect to social organization. The Brahman caste system is certainly the most terrible chain ever laid upon mankind. Three thousand mutually exclusive castes, from which there is no escape, unless through a complete change of religion and loss of social position, bind men to a set of social ceremonies and observances which practically enslave them through life, and are accompanied with such pecuniary expenditures that they entail the economic dependence of the poorer classes. Like Buddhism, this religion inculcates mildness of manners, and especially clemency toward animals. Its most important religious belief is that of the transmigration of souls. This terrible fantasm of the eternal recurrence of existence, of a never-ceasing rotation, is the secret of the deadening influence of Brahmanism upon individuality. We can see how the doctrine of Buddha may constitute a gospel to people accustomed to such a belief: the idea that after all there is an end, a death, a final forgetting of all the troubles and woes of existence, was to Orientals as joyful tidings as the gospel of eternal life to the early Christians. This also shows why the success of Christian missions among these people will be but moderate until their whole way of thinking is transformed. The doctrine of an eternal existence has no fascination for these millions who have been accustomed to the terrifying thought of unending life and ever-recurring birth. Still, during the past century, indirectly Christianity has had a great influence upon Brahmanism in strengthening the monotheistic currents in that system. As early as 1830 the Brahmo Somaj, the society of one God, was formed, and its influence in restoring the old monotheistic idea of the Vedic literature has been most powerful. At the same time, the more personal relations between divinity and the individual have been emphasized. But Brahmanism shows no tendency

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to give up its idea of the all-pervading character of the deity; that is, it remains pantheistic and refuses to individualize God.

Mohammedanism, the second great religion of India, is on all points opposed to the Brahman system. It is strictly monotheistic, intolerant of divergent forms, and, in its social organization, democratic. All believers are equal before the law, and there is no legal nobility. For that reason this religion at present still draws largely from the lower castes in India, to whom a change of faith thus means a liberation from caste tyranny. Missionary propaganda is carried on with the greatest energy; and the methods of Christian evangelists, in preaching and distributing tracts, are in general use. The question of the solidarity of Islam throughout the world is of the very greatest political importance. Through modern means of communication and the newspaper press, this solidarity is becoming stronger every day; and the Mohammedans of India are taking a keen interest in the affairs of their co-religionists in Africa, Turkey, and Russia. It is not too much to say that this vast body of fanatic believers is preparing itself for concerted action, and that, if they continue to develop a national spirit, the Mohammedans will decide the future not only of Asia, but of the world. Or, to put it in different language, the ability to hold them in check and to manage them will constitute the stepping stone to the mastery of the Orient. This fact explains the great solicitude of both Britain and Russia toward the faithful of Islam. In her whole policy, England must constantly keep in view her Mohammedan subjects in India. She cannot afford openly to offend or to thwart the Sultan of Turkey, whom most Moslemites look upon as the secular head of their religion. This point may yet be of cardinal importance in the Egyptian question, should the Sultan decide by his own impulse, or be prevailed upon by England's rivals, to emphasize his rights of suzerainty over the Khedive. The tolerance of Russia for the Mohammedan faith is explained by the same reason. Unless Russia can conciliate Islam, she can never think of conquering India or of establishing herself firmly in any part of southern Asia.

The earlier attempts of the British to interfere in matters of religion were ended by the Sepoy revolt of 1857, which was largely caused by the fear of the Hindoos that they were to be rapidly Europeanized. By her special command, Queen Victoria in 1858 established the policy of non-interference in native religious affairs. But while the Government has given up the idea of a sudden and radical change, liberal philosophy in England has been strong enough to uphold the idea of a gradual assimilation through education. Upon the establishment of Western

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

schools in India followed the creation of a native press; that, in turn, demanded representative institutions. But the hope that the Indian people might be led to some measure of self-government has been cruelly deceived. So unsuccessful have these measures been in building up national feeling and making national action possible, that hostile critics of England assert that they were devised merely to cause bitter dissensions among the races and religions of India, and to enable Great Britain to follow the policy of *divide et impera*.

It was Macaulay's belief that a race could not be politically assimilated without being given the language and general culture of the governing nation. Hence, there was devised for the Hindoos, through Sir Charles Wood, a system of education based upon English models. At Madras, Bombay, Calcutta, and other towns, examining universities were established. These give periodical tests in the classics, English, history, and the natural sciences, to the aspiring youth of India, who have been educated in the affiliated colleges. The docile race of Hindoos, unwarlike and fond of intellectual pursuits, took very readily to this change, — especially as it led to a career, modest, to be sure, but stable, in the Indian administration. But it has been found that most of the students, gifted as they are with marvellous Oriental memories, put on Western learning like a cloak, and do not permit it to influence the true fibre of their intellect and character. They will memorize volumes of translations or treatises upon history, and astonish the examiners with detailed knowledge; but, like Orientals in general, they lack originality. The successful candidates enter the administration as subordinate clerks. Those who fail often become the victims of hopeless despondency, which leads at times even to suicide. Out of such native elements there is formed a docile bureaucracy, methodical, systematic, and fond of statistics and cumbersome reports, with which they fill the central offices to overflowing. The Mohammedans have in general refused to attend the Europeanized schools, and they likewise refuse to be governed in any manner by Hindoo officials, whom they despise as slave-born and unwarlike. The native press is recruited very largely from dissatisfied elements among the educated; and it is, therefore, given over to stirring up animosities between the natives and the English, and between the different religions and races in the Empire.

The year 1884 saw the last great manifestation of Liberalism in England. The influence of the Ministry was at that time used for extending the system of representative government to the colonies. Jamaica and Mauritius were given representative assemblies. In India elective

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Municipal Councils were created, and a National Congress was for the first time convoked. The latter, to be sure, is purely advisory and deliberative, but it has always cherished the greatest hopes and aspirations for true national self-government. As it is, however, its existence has led only to accentuated racial hostility. When the Congress declared itself in favor of national elections by general suffrage, the Mohammedans immediately withdrew. As they are in the minority, they would under such a system be ruled by the Hindoos, and to this they would never peacefully submit. As a matter of fact, representative institutions are impossible in a country where no national parties can exist. In India the line of cleavage will always be along religious divisions; and the adoption of the electoral system would mean government by members of the most numerous religion, Hindooism. In the Municipal Councils, established in 1884, Mohammedans and the Christian merchants and industrials are practically unrepresented, and the Hindoos there, as in the National Congress, consume the time with fruitless criticism and vague discussions, without doing any practical work of government. These assemblies are in fact permanent indignation meetings. For this reason, and on account of the fierce party dissensions, the Government has within the last five years been forced to suspend elections in nearly thirty of the municipalities of India. Indeed, the system of electoral representation is at present being abandoned in all the tropical colonies of Europe.

One of the most deplorable results of these attempted reforms is the growing inter-racial hostility, the accentuated mutual hatred of Hindoos and Moslems. The English, moreover, have practically formed themselves into a caste, the highest caste, even above the priestly Brahmans. The intercourse between the conquerors and the people is, therefore, becoming more and more distant and formal. Unlike the older Anglo-Indians, the present British officials do not allow themselves to become attached to India, but remain English through frequent returns to the mother country. The case of Lord Roberts, "Bobs Bahadur," who spent forty years in the Indian service, is so rare as to excite comment, although it would not have been unusual at an earlier period.

The principal glory of the English régime in India has been that it has established the equal enforcement of law and justice; but even here there are unsuspected drawbacks. Jury trial among the natives, for instance, is made difficult of administration, because they will not dissociate themselves from their prejudices or instinctive likings. For the same reason, it is impossible to obtain reliable testimony. Two large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties of men will appear before the magistrate and swear to directly opposite statements of fact; leaving the judge to gather the truth by an exercise of intuition. The fact is that Hindoos cannot be brought to look upon giving testimony as anything else than compurgation in support of the oath of their relative or fellow townsman. To swear the truth in cases where it would support their opponent or enemy would appear to them preposterous and "akin to madness." The use of the jury system has led to another grave difficulty. European jurors refuse to convict a white man guilty of the murder of a native. These juries are mostly composed of men of the lower middle class, among whom the arrogance of the imperial race is most potent and apparent. The native papers, as a result, constantly inveigh against the rulers of the country for giving themselves practical immunity from the law.

In still another way has the equal enforcement of the law in the Orient brought unexpected results, namely, in connection with the strict enforcement of the payment of debts. Before the European occupation creditors were not permitted to extort their claims in years of famine or distress. Moreover, usurers were periodically obliged to disgorge, and fill the coffers of the prince, much to the relief of the taxpayers. But with the strict enforcement of law, the business of the usurer has become an exceedingly profitable one; especially in years of want will he enrich himself by the forfeitures of his defaulting debtors. In this manner the lands of India are gradually passing into the hands of the money-lenders. In the Northwest Provinces almost half of the real property is already owned by this class. The same thing occurs in all countries where a population which has to live up to the limit of its resources is brought under the strict enforcement of contract law. The peasant is too weak in this economic struggle. Unless he is protected by legislation like that of the Dutch in Java, which absolutely forbids a native to sell or mortgage his property, he will sooner or later become a victim to his necessities. When we come into undisputed possession of the Philippine Islands, it will be one of our most urgent duties to protect the peasant proprietor from encroachment by the exploiting capitalist.

In this manner many things that were meant for the best have turned out ill, if not in general, at least in respect to some classes. Strict justice has further impoverished the poor. A liberal education has led to a superficially acquired culture, and a cumbersome system of administration. A free press and public representation but accentuate the obstacles in the way of the growth of a free nationality. While we know that these measures have been the result of the liberal ideals of British policy, still

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their effect has been such that the hostile critics of Great Britain may claim that she has deliberately set about to impoverish her subjects and to sow dissensions among the different races, in order to fasten her authority upon them.

Considering all this, we cannot escape the conclusion that our Western ideas of political organization are utterly unadapted to the Orient, and that, when applied, they often lead to the opposite result from that intended. The political complexion of the Orient is a theocratic absolutism combined with local self-government. This absolutism, the expression of divine will and the result of custom, is itself bound by divine law and customary observance. Thus, the ruler of old India had to move within the limits of the Brahman law; in China, Confucianism fixes the functions of government; while the Sultan of Turkey must yield to the commands of the Koran as interpreted by the Turkish pope, the Sheik of the Islam. Local self-government is protected by this customary law, and so in Oriental countries there is very little interference by the central governments in ordinary affairs. But, should the ruler decide to act in any particular case, his authority is unquestioned, and punishment, death, and disgrace are taken at his hand with the same fatalism with which the Oriental suffers disease and misfortune.

Indeed, every Oriental ruler looks upon himself, and is regarded by his people, as a direct representative of God. He claims direct relationship with divinity, and he is accorded the deepest personal loyalty by his subjects. Alexander, the conqueror of the Orient, knew what he was about when he declared himself the son of the great God Ammon; and when Napoleon, two thousand years later, followed in the steps of the great Macedonian tamer of horses and men, he was glad to make use of a legend which foretold the return of the proud Iskander in the person of a Frankish hero. Even to-day, in the native states of India, the princes are literally worshipped by their subjects. The Chinese, a most rationalistic and business-like people, revere their Emperor as the representative of Heaven; believe that the soil of their country is sacred; and regard the government as appointed to counsel and lead them in all matters after the eternal wisdom. The natives of the Dutch colonies in Java and Sumatra bow reverently before the statue of the Queen of Holland; and a similar religious feeling manifested itself in India toward the late Empress. At the time of her last jubilee an Indian paper said: "The Indian people are, by nature and by virtue of their religious principles, more loyal than Englishmen. Indian loyalty is a hundred times deeper and sincerer than English loyalty. In England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Queen is only a constitutional monarch. In India she is a goddess incarnate."

The great possibilities inherent in this sentiment are just now dawning upon Englishmen; and they hope to turn it into a harmonizing bond among all the various creeds and races of India. While representative institutions cannot build up the feeling of nationality and solidarity, the sentiment of loyalty to an Emperor, of personal attachment to a revered master, can be utilized as a unifying principle. It is urged, with great truth, that her religious Czardom gives Russia the greatest advantage in dealing with Orientals, and that England, to hold her own, must develop a similar institution. Although it may at first seem amusing to think of Edward VII as a son of Heaven and the emblem of all divine virtue, we can readily imagine a Hindoo multitude kneeling before his image and doing worship to "His Imperial Highness." Mr. Theodore Morrison, in his "Imperial Rule in India," goes so far as to say: "We should be willing to forego some of the liberties at home which impede our sway in India." This brief statement will most potently reveal to us the influence which the successful maintenance of Oriental empire must inevitably entail upon a Western nation. To a certain extent it must modify its domestic institutions to meet the exigencies of Oriental society. Formerly the English were prone to complain that the Indians were so little thankful for the blessings of orderly government and material progress which they enjoy under the British régime. They are coming to see now that the only method of attaching Oriental populations is through the principle of personal loyalty. An absolute monarch, with a loyal following of leading men, strictly enforcing his will, but in general leaving the local communities to manage their own affairs — that is the ideal form of government in the Orient.

We cannot sufficiently emphasize the universality of local self-government throughout the East. Oriental despotism does not mean constant governmental interference. The despot is irresistible when he acts; but he will not choose to act contrary to the general customs of the realm, because these customs are sacred, and on their sacredness his own customary authority depends. The chief functions of the central Government are consequently taxation and defence. Ordinary affairs are left largely to the local communities. We must, however, avoid the mistake of reading our individualistic ideas into this system. In the Orient the individual is nothing, the family, guild, or caste is everything; so that there local self-determining societies coexist with the greatest social tyranny. The birth of an individual determines his so-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cial position, his profession, his religion. In China and India the trades of house industry are inherited from generation to generation, and the strict customs of the guild are never departed from. The Hindoos would consider it unnatural that the son should not follow the occupation for which he had been prepared by his ancestry. These closely organized local societies manage their own affairs with very little interference by the central Government. The most democratic of the Asiatics are the fighting races, like the Turkomans and Pathans; but institutions of local self-government exist throughout the Orient. In India they have to a large extent been destroyed by a mistaken policy of centralization; but since 1858 it has been the unswerving purpose of England to leave a constantly larger area to self-administration, in the form of native states. In these, England simply regulates the finances and the army, and leaves the entire local administration to the native officials.

The system was first developed by the Dutch in Java, where the native society, with all its princes and other political dignitaries and all its customs of government, was preserved intact. The Dutch merely placed by the side of each native chieftain a resident whose advice became controlling, but who never openly interfered with the course of administration; so that the natives were left in the belief that they retained their old rulers. It was the constant policy of Holland to prevent all disturbance to the settled society, and scrupulously to abstain from all attempts at assimilation. In a similar manner the Russians preserve the local institutions in Central Asia; and even France has learned in the rough school of historical experience that she cannot make Parisians of the Indo-Chinese. She is now gradually adopting the policy of leaving native customs and institutions undisturbed. Governor Doumer of Indo-China, one of the most successful of her colonial statesmen, says, in a recent report to his Government, that it is imperative to refrain from all interference with the customs and religion of the natives. What a change since 1885, when Paul Bert proclaimed the French "rights of man" in the native towns upon his accession to the Governorship of Tonkin! The French have carried the policy of assimilation very far; they have even introduced representative institutions with manhood suffrage in their colonies of Martinique, Guadeloupe, Senegal, and French India; but their experience has been such as to discourage all further efforts in this direction. In Tunis, on the other hand, where they have adopted the model of a protectorate without interference with local institutions, they have scored the one success of their colonial policy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is, however, in Spanish colonial politics that the idea of assimilation has been carried farthest. In accordance with her Latin character, it was Spain's first effort to make the natives adopt her own religion, institutions, customs, and dress. All local and tribal organization was destroyed, and the social life was fitted into a rigid autocratic mechanism. As a result of this assimilation, of this creation of a tax-gathering machine, the life of the colonies was sterilized, and their loss became but a question of time. An entirely different policy was pursued by Holland and England in Ceylon and Java, perhaps the most successful colonies in the Orient. In these islands the population, though increasing very rapidly, is living in great material comfort and happiness. The inherited customs have not been interfered with; and the natives are protected against exploitation, though they have no elective institutions. Representation in the colonial councils is by appointment; and in every appointment the local interests, both racial and industrial, are considered. What these regions need is not politics, but wise and experienced administration; not assimilation, but sympathy and assistance in achieving their peculiar destiny. The best, and, in fact, the only possible, manner of conciliating the natives of any country to a régime of foreign control is to respect the native characteristics, and to appoint as governors men who have the natural gift to command, who will be obeyed as readily and as willingly as was Lord Roberts in India, because they are gentlemen and born to leadership. Moreover, the road to power must not be closed to able and ambitious native leaders who have legitimate influence among their countrymen. Even to-day the memory of Akbar is revered in India, because he made Hindoos governors of provinces; and it is in this way that Russia is gaining the good will of her subject populations.

How do these considerations bear upon the broader question of ultimate supremacy in Asia? It is certain that Russia to-day feels herself the appointed mediator between the Orient and the West, and that she believes that destiny has called *her* to lead the swarming peoples of the Orient into a higher civilization. Characteristic expressions of this belief are common, but none can be more weighty than those of a great Russian prince and of a famous general. In his proclamation on the day after the terrible slaughter at Geok Teppe, when the power of the Turkomans had been broken forever, General Skobeleff said:

"A new era has opened for the Tekkes, an era of equality and of guaranteed possession of property for all, without distinction. Our Central Asian policy recognizes no pariahs. Herein lies our superiority over the English."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the same year he wrote:

"England lays a heavy hand upon her dependent peoples. She reduces them to a state of slavery, only that English trade may flourish and Englishmen grow rich. Thousands of natives in India only await Russia's crusade for deliverance. Russia gives full liberty to native customs."

The other authority is one of the principal exponents of the Asiatic policy of Russia, Prince Oukhtomsky, the President of the Russo-Chinese Bank and editor of the "Journal of St. Petersburg." He accompanied the Czarowitch Nicholas on his voyage through the Orient; and, in recounting his experiences, he gave a characteristic expression of the attitude of Russia toward Asia. "Asia," he says, "we have always belonged to it. We have lived its life, and felt its interests. Through us the Orient has gradually arrived at consciousness of itself, at a superior life." He finds endless points of similarity between the Orient and Russia. An Englishman in India is in a strange country; to the Russian, however, Asia is home; the Asiatics are his brothers. Continuing he writes:

"We have nothing to conquer. All these peoples of various races feel themselves drawn to us, and are our brothers by blood, by tradition, and by ideas. We simply approach them more closely. This great and mysterious Orient is ready to become ours."

He holds the same view as Skobeleff on the character of English government in Asia. "The English," he says, "lack that broad generosity by which the Russians admit natives to high commands. India is full of unhappiness and misery."

Examples of this nature might be indefinitely multiplied; but those above given sufficiently indicate the attitude and temper of the Russian mind, and as such they are documents of great practical importance. This does not say that they are true. It is not at all certain that the Indian masses would rise impulsively to welcome the Russian deliverer from British dominion. Nor is the treatment which the Russians accord the Asiatics always that of brotherly love. The cruelty of their conquests is proverbial, and they do not spare the heavy hand on other occasions. But opinions like the above are the basis of the Russian policy in Asia. It is, moreover, certainly true that the customs and institutions of Russia bear a close analogy to those of Asia, and that the Russian peasant, as he gradually penetrates into the far East, does not discover anything that is absolutely foreign to him. From the cupolas of the Kremlin to the pagodas of Peking the transition is very gradual. The religious autocracy of the Russian central government, the local autonomy of the *mir*, and the external system of ceremonies of the Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

religion — these all readily lend themselves to extension into the Orient. The beliefs among the masses are largely of a formal and superstitious nature. The cult of St. Nicholas and the Virgin, the belief in forest and river spirits, and the use of amulets and incantations place the Russian peasant on a plane from which he will readily understand the beliefs and superstitions of the Orientals. Dogmatic theology plays no part in his religion. Of the greatest importance in this connection is the splendor of the religious functions connected with the Czardom. The representatives of all the Oriental peoples subject to Russia, who assemble to witness a coronation, are impressed with the divine attributes of the Czar; and their belief in his irresistible power becomes almost instinctive.

The democratic basis of her autocracy will also be a great help to Russia in the Orient. Asia is the land of the common people; and, notwithstanding its vast over-population, the life of the ordinary people is perhaps happier there than anywhere else, as their horizon is limited and they are easily contented. Pleasures are cheap and are indulged in with zest. Who could ever forget Lafcadio Hearn's description of the festivities of the Japanese people, prepared with no expense, and still so full of beauty and joy? The secret of all this is that art has not been taken out of the life of the common people; that folklore is not dead as it is in the West. Throughout the Orient the house industry still exists and the people who manufacture the beautiful rugs, the delicate textiles, the artistic pottery of the Orient, certainly have a more pleasant occupation than the operatives in our factories, with the dull and soul-killing routine of machine work. When we think of the rich folklore of the East, of the poetic fancies which are handed down from generation to generation, of the intense hero-worship among the masses, how poor and dreary appears the life of the working people in our large cities, though as far as material comforts go they are usually far better provided.

The mystic element is the strongest in Oriental life. The Oriental would rather imagine and interpret than understand. He does not long to lift the veil of mystery that shrouds religion and authority. In this respect, too, Russia is strong. As her great Dostojevski has said: "Russia cannot be understood; she must be believed in." The Orientals are ready to believe in anything that surrounds itself with splendor and the emblems of authority.

With our practical Western nature, it is difficult for us to understand the spirituality of the Orient. Spirit is everywhere; the poorest Hindoo peasant constantly feels its immanence. To the Chinese, air and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

soil are peopled with genii. The Japanese build delicate temples in woodland glades. No human being ever enters them; but many gaze reverently through the latticed windows into the twilight silence within, where abide the ghosts of divinities and of noble men. Perhaps the highest and purest expression of this belief is found in the readiness for hero-worship among Oriental nations, and especially among the people of India. The great man, the noble character, is a direct impersonation of the divine spirit; and to worship him appears a most natural thought. Thus, the Oriental feels himself surrounded on all sides by spiritual forces, by whose influence his life is moulded.

The one important conception which the Oriental mind lacks is that these mysterious and all-powerful manifestations are themselves governed by a great law. The reign of natural law is foreign to the Orientals, who live under a tyranny of capricious spirits. The idea of gradual, orderly development according to a universal rule, the cosmos of the physical world, they cannot conceive. How can the Oriental mind be endowed with this idea? Many believe that race characteristics are so persistent that the Orient will never lose its mystic character. It seems, however, beyond doubt that a continued introduction of the mechanical appliances and processes of the West must necessarily lead Orientals to a complete change in their philosophy of life. Thus in a measure may they repeat the experience of the ancient Pagan world as set forth by the poet Shelley:

"Swift as the radiant shapes of sleep
From one whose dreams are Paradise
Fly, when the fond wretch wakes to weep,
And Day peers forth with her blank eyes;
So fleet, so faint, so fair,
The Powers of Earth and Air
Fled from the folding-star of Bethlehem:
Apollo, Pan, and Love,
And even Olympian Jove,
Grew weak, for killing Truth had glared on them.
Our hills and seas and streams,
Dispeopled of their dreams,
Their waters turned to blood, their dew to tears,
Wailed for the golden years."

A radical change in the character of Oriental thought and life would deeply affect and might even endanger the entire world. The Oriental societies have existed for thousands of years. They have assumed a fixed and apparently unchangeable character. The dissolution of this stability through the introduction of the mechanism of Western

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civilization would not only disturb the philosophical ideas of the Orientals, but would also create an army of anarchistical revolutionaries. Such was the character of the Boxers. As Mgr. Favier has remarked, they were pure communists, *sansculottes*. Fanatical hordes, freed from the restraint of their inherited social laws, scourged into bitter dissatisfaction by the loss of their livelihood through the introduction of machinery, will be ready to burn, rob, and murder indiscriminately the rich of their own nation and foreign intruders. Therefore, the application of these progressive methods of thought and action to a static society is fraught with the greatest danger. Whether these societies can ever be made progressive in a Western sense is, indeed, very questionable. For eons they have been stationary and mystical; and even among the Japanese, Western civilization is but a thin veneer.

It would seem, then, that it is not well to be too optimistic, to raise our hopes and expectations too high, in the matter of civilizing the Orient according to Western standards, and of allowing alien races to participate in the benefits of our institutions. We should rather give attention to the inborn psychological characteristics of these populations, and make sure what effect the launching at them of our peculiar ideas and methods will have before we attempt a work of wholesale regeneration. Whether the introduction of Western industrialism will have a profound influence on the character of the Orientals has not as yet become apparent; and still this is the only promising avenue of approach. In matters of thought and religion, the belief of the Orientals in the superiority of their own civilization is practically unshaken.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORK OF THE CUBAN CONVENTION.

THE United States occupied the island of Cuba as a Government of Intervention after clearly and solemnly announcing its purpose in the terms of the now familiar Joint Resolution of April 20, 1898, the special propositions of which were:

"That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

American sympathy for a struggling people had been stirred by harrowing tales of Spanish atrocity, and a spirit of vengeance had been roused by the disaster to the *Maine*. For several weeks prior to the passage of this Resolution, President McKinley had been striving to effect an armistice between Spain and her rebellious colony. While such a step might have met the approval of that large percentage of Cubans whose desire was autonomy or some measure of self-government under the Spanish flag, it was rejected by those belligerents whose cry was always "*Independencia ó muerte.*"

The message of President McKinley to Congress, under date of April 11, 1898, makes no mention of Cuban independence. In the "name of humanity and civilization," and because of "menace to American interests," he asked authority to use the forces of the United States for the purpose of quickly and effectively terminating the hostilities, and for assuring the establishment of a stable government in the island. While American intervention may have been looked for and hoped for by many Cubans, at no time had Cuba or its representatives asked for that intervention. They had asked, and practically demanded, recognition of their rights as belligerents. For intervention they did not ask. Knowing the position of matters in Washington, the trend of Mr. McKinley's message, and the terms of that message, the Cubans saw before them but two courses: either annexation to the United States or autonomy of some kind under Spanish domination. Neither of these was acceptable to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fighting Cubans, who, through their representatives, then demanded that, in the event of the proposed intervention, the United States should definitely and distinctly declare the independence of the island. Failing that, it was declared that the interveners would be regarded as intruders, and that their intrusion would be resisted. The Joint Resolution was framed in response to this demand. The original text of the Resolution provided for the recognition of the "Republic of Cuba as the true and lawful Government of the island." After thorough debate, this clause was struck out, and the bill became a law, which met with little opposition or protest from the American people. It was many months before any serious note of objection to it was heard.

By the Protocol of August, 1898, Spain renounced her claim to sovereignty over the island of Cuba. On January 1, 1899, under the provisions of the Treaty of Paris, the date of which was December 10, 1898, Spain ceased her official occupation of the island, and the United States assumed possession, as a Government of Intervention, "for the pacification thereof." That pacification being accomplished, the United States, by its own declaration, was to leave the "government and control of the island to its people."

Two years and more have passed, and a then friendly and cordial Cuba has become, in large measure, a hostile Cuba. Assuming the standard of successful government to be a contented and reasonably happy people, trusting, honoring, and respecting their governor, America has failed in her experience in Cuba. Absorbed in personal and in national interests which presented features of greater immediate importance, the great majority of the American people have kept in but vague and general touch with Cuban affairs. The occasional complaints and rumors of discontent were generally assumed to be trivial and unavoidable, the natural result of a period of reorganization. Reports came announcing that the hungry had been fed, and that provision had been made for the sick and the homeless. Other reports indicated a remarkable measure of industrial rehabilitation. There were no riots and no revolts. All of these statements were facts. It was, therefore, assumed that all was well in the island, and busy America turned her thoughts and her interests in other directions. The recent developments have come as a surprise to many, if not to the great majority, of the American people. In what lies the cause, immediate or more remote, of a condition which is, at its best expression, most unfortunate, and where lies the blame for it?

The "pacification" of Cuba may be said to have been effected within the first six months of American occupation. There was no one, except

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States, whom the Cubans could fight, and there was no inclination to pick a quarrel with such a power. There was no disposition to fight among themselves. It remains a question whether it was not the duty of, and whether it would not have been wiser for, the United States to have then set on foot the processes of an independent government. No expressed legislation bound us to the establishment of a "stable government." That figure of speech occurs only in the message of the President, which does not constitute a law. "Stable government" is a condition for which due provision may be made, but which cannot be guaranteed by constitutional or legislative enactment. The United States is responsible for the proper maintenance of peace, law, and order, in Cuba, by virtue of the very act which originally took her to the island, namely, the effective termination of a state of disorder which had become an "offence to civilization," and "intolerable" to the American people.

The first year of American occupation saw the affairs of the island administered by General John R. Brooke, a soldier with a soldier's training and experience. As might have been expected his régime was not a notable success. The authorities in Washington had formulated no policy regarding the method of administration, and the only policy pursued was one of drift and opportunism. During the year there developed to some extent in Cuba a sentiment in favor of annexation. In the United States a similar tendency could be observed among a class of persons not large numerically, but representing financial and commercial interests not to be easily ignored in politics. Advantage was taken by this element of every possible argument against Cuban independence, and in favor of the permanent retention of that which, by an approved act of legislation, had been declared "free and independent." There are many who believe that General Brooke's removal, at the end of the year, was effected for the purpose of advancing the annexation movement. Others believe it to have been due to his general unfitness for such a position, and to the fact that affairs in Cuba were, even then, in an unsatisfactory condition.

General Brooke was followed by General Leonard Wood, whose appointment was due, in part, to the personal interest of the President in that officer, and, in part, to a widespread supposition that the appointee had displayed in Santiago Province administrative qualities which marked him as fitted for the larger post. In spite of the vast amount of work accomplished along philanthropic, sanitary, and educational lines, the second year of American administration closed upon a condition even more unsatisfactory than existed at the close of the first year. The things

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had been done were things which it was well to have done, but they were not the things which the Cubans most wanted, and the doing of them was a cause of discontent rather than of satisfaction. If anything, General Wood had really made fewer friends and more enemies for the United States than had General Brooke.

On April 18, 1900, there was issued Civil Order No. 164, which provided an electoral law and directed the holding of an election for the establishment of self-governing municipalities throughout the island. At about the same time, the matter of the American Presidential election began to take shape; and it became evident that the Democratic party was planning, as a part of its campaign, an attack upon the administration for having continued American military government in the island of Cuba, thereby failing to carry out the terms of the Joint Resolution of April, 1898. Probably for the reason that this threatened attack constituted a somewhat serious menace to the political supremacy of the Republican party, rather than from any other cause, it was decided to make a further provision for self-government in Cuba, by calling a Constitutional Convention. This call was issued, under date of July 25, 1900, as Civil Order No. 301. After rehearsing the essential clauses of the Joint Resolution, that Order proceeds as follows:

"And, whereas, the people of Cuba have established municipal governments deriving their authority from the suffrages of the people given under just and equal laws, and are now ready, in like manner, to proceed to the establishment of a general government which shall assume and exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction and control over the island;

Therefore, it is ordered that a general election be held in the island of Cuba on the third Saturday of September, in the year nineteen hundred, to elect delegates to a Convention to meet in the City of Havana, at twelve o'clock noon on the first Monday of November, in the year nineteen hundred, to frame and adopt a Constitution for the people of Cuba, and, as a part thereof, to provide for and agree with the Government of the United States upon the relations to exist between that Government and the Government of Cuba, and to provide for the election by the people of officers under such Constitution and the transfer of government to the officers so elected."

The announcement of the terms of this call brought out criticism in the United States and protest in Cuba. Political parties refused to participate under such terms; individuals refused to go to the polls; and candidates expressed their determination, in the event of their election, to resign from the Convention, unless the terms were modified by the excision of the specially objectionable point that provision for and agreement with the United States, in the matter of "relations," be embodied in the Constitution, "as a part thereof." Relying upon oral assurances which were given them that this clause would be modified, the Cubans

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

held their election, and the successful candidates duly assembled in Havana upon the date specified, "the first Monday of November." Lack of space forbids a review here of the terms and conditions of the electoral law, or of the methods employed in the processes of the election. Such a consideration would be interesting and instructive, but it would be useless, inasmuch as the body which assembled in the Marti Theatre in Havana, on November 5, 1900, was, and can only be regarded as, the legally elected and constituted representative of the Cuban people. As a matter of fact, the point whether or not it was representative is decidedly open to discussion. As a matter of law, it is not.

The promise of modification of the conditions expressed in Order No. 301, was faithfully kept. Upon the day of assembly, General Wood read to the delegates that which now stands, under date of November 9, 1900, as Civil Order No. 455. It runs as follows:

"*To the Delegates of the Constitutional Convention of Cuba:*

GENTLEMEN.—As Military Governor of the island, representing the President of the United States, I call this Convention to order.

It will be your duty, first, to frame and adopt a Constitution for Cuba, and, when that has been done, to formulate what, in your opinion, ought to be the relations between Cuba and the United States.

The Constitution must be adequate to secure a stable, orderly, and free government."

For some reason, this order does not appear to have received wide circulation in the United States. If it did get into circulation it received little attention. When the special issue involved became prominent, namely, that of the separation of the matter of the Constitution from that of mutual relations, and the substitution of an expression of "opinion" in the place of a provision for and agreement with the United States upon the subject of those relations, the Convention was widely denounced in this country for its failure to include in the Constitution that which it was told to leave out. Not only did the official and formal instructions separate the two, but General Wood, after having read these instructions to the assembled Convention, delivered a brief and informal address in which he emphasized the point. A local paper, in its issue of the following morning, reported the incident as follows:

"When Secretary Verona had concluded reading the Spanish translation of the address, General Wood made a few more plain remarks to the delegates. He wanted them to understand that they had been elected to form a Constitution for Cuba. That was their plain duty. The matter of relations which should exist between Cuba and the United States was another matter. He wished them success."

This point is of some importance from the fact that there is every reason for the belief that, owing to a mistaken view of the exact situa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, many Americans assumed that the Cuban Convention was deliberately violating its definite instructions, and became prejudiced against the Cubans as a result of this assumption. It is certain that much unkindly criticism and unfavorable comment appeared in the columns of the daily press and the magazines. This comment and criticism reached Havana, and not a little of it was copied by the local papers as an indication of American sentiment. The effect of this was unwholesome. Merited criticism is not always acceptable. Carping criticism, based upon inadequate information, is quite sure to result in resentment.

From the very beginning of the work of the Convention, there was a tacit, if not definitely expressed, understanding that the United States was to stand wholly aloof from its proceedings. Owing to the practical impossibility of absolutely verifying certain rumors and suspicions which one is obliged to credit without being able to establish them for general acceptance, it is not easy to make any statement respecting the degree of strictness with which this professed policy of non-interference was observed during the earlier days of the sittings. The term "obstructionists" came to the surface when the regular public sessions began; and a fair number of members believed that the so-called obstructionist element was influenced by the military government. A motion to hold night sessions, in addition to the regular afternoon sessions, was introduced, partly for the more rapid despatch of the work of the Convention, and partly for the purpose of forcing all or some of the suspected obstructionists to declare themselves. But no direct interference appeared until the middle of February.

The story of Cuba's Constitution making is generally similar to the story of all deliberative and legislative bodies. It is a story of interesting routine; of work in committee rooms, in private and in public sessions; of the manœuvring of political parties to secure party advantage or party supremacy; of tiresome discussion and heated debate; of effort to secure the adoption of this plan or that plan, and to prevent the acceptance of this theory or that theory. On February 11, fifteen weeks from the day of the opening session, the Cuban Constitution was completed and accepted in its final form, although it was not signed until February 21. The value and the merit of the instrument are matters of opinion. In criticising it, Americans will do well to remember that it was framed by Cubans for a Cuban Government, and not by Americans for an American Government. It is not a perfect instrument, in all probability; but it should not be forgotten that American State Constitutions have been amended and even newly framed from time to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, and that America's National Constitution has had the benefit of several amendments, numerous decisions regarding the exact meaning of certain passages, and an endless amount of both mild and forcible criticism. The Cuban Constitution, like all similar documents, is a working basis for a nation, and is capable of modification if and when exigencies may arise. Numerous eminent authorities in the United States have expressed their opinion that with the Cuban Constitution the United States has nothing to do. By the declaration of an American Congress, Cuba "is, and of right ought to be, free and independent." By the declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States, Cuba is a foreign country. Action upon the Constitution of a free and independent foreign country is beyond the scope of American authority.

The Constitution having been duly framed and adopted, in strict accordance with the instructions given, the next step in the sequence of those instructions was the formulation of what, in the "opinion" of the Convention, "ought to be the relations between Cuba and the United States." It was at this point and upon this subject that the present trouble began. Washington was beginning to realize the possible error of General Wood's assurances that the work of the Cuban Convention would require no attention at the hands of Congress during the session then in progress. The month of January had developed, first, intimations that the Cuban Constitution might be up in time for action; then, indications that it would be up; and, soon after, quite distinct assurance of its submission about the middle of February. This was somewhat disconcerting to the Washington plans. It raised for Congressional consideration an unexpected question, for which Congress was not ready. Talk of an extra session began to be heard. No one desired such a session; yet, for a time, it seemed imperative. The talk which was made about it misled the members of the Convention, who, unwisely, relied too much upon that event, and dallied a little with their work. Had they, as they might and should have done, kept up the pace of the month of January, their Constitution might well have been completed and signed by February 10. But time was lost through reliance upon reports which strongly indicated that an extra session would be held for the consideration of Cuban affairs.

The practical completion of the Constitution, on February 11, was followed by the appointment of a central committee to prepare and to submit to the Convention projects concerning the matter of relations. This committee was composed of Señores Diego Tamayo, Gonzalo de Quesada, Juan Gualberto Gomez, Enrique Villuendas, and Manuel Ramon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Silva. Before they had settled down to their work, there came that unwise violation of the policy of non-interference. For some unknown reason, unless, indeed, it was misled by questionable information, our own Government appears to have assumed that the Cubans would draft some form of proposals, and submit the requested "opinion" in terms which would not suit the Washington plan. The few close observers who were in Cuba watching every move and turn of act and sentiment in the Convention had no such idea. It is true that there was division of opinion among the members of the Convention; but there had been division upon many points in the process of framing the Constitution. The only vital points lay in these facts: (1) that, in that Constitution, all matters relating to alien people or to foreign countries were drawn upon broadly liberal lines; and (2) that again and again in the processes of debate the matter of relations to the United States had been touched upon, usually in terms which clearly showed a recognition of Cuba's dependence upon that country in many ways, and which evinced a desire for the closest and most harmonious of connections. There had been expressions which showed a realization of all that America had done for Cuba, and of America's rights and interests in Cuba's affairs. The proper time to consider the Cuban "opinion of what ought to be the relations" would have been when the Cubans had done their work and submitted that opinion. The interference which now occurred was premature, ill-advised, and most unfortunate in its results.

About January 1, there appeared in the local papers two sets of propositions, of which the following is a translation. The first provides:

"I. The Republic of Cuba regards as a necessity for its preservation, in accordance with the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, establishment of definite relations of friendship and commerce with all other nations; in order to maintain the principles of that doctrine she will proceed in all cases, in peace as well as in war, in common accord with the United States.

II. The Republic of Cuba will place at the disposal of the United States, should the latter so desire, part of the shore of any bay on the North coast and of any two bays on the South coast of Cuba; such territory conceded to be selected by the United States and to be used for establishment of naval and coaling stations, the concessions to be of sufficient area to permit of proper defence and sanitation.

III. The Republic of Cuba will put herself on a war footing whenever the United States shall consider her assistance necessary to defend or protect the independence of the States which constitute the entire American continent.

IV. Amplification of these conditions shall correspond with the foregoing, and dispositions for complying therewith shall be embodied in a special message from the head of the Government of the Republic to the co-legislative bodies."

The other proposition stipulates:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I. Sent by the people of Cuba, we are freely congregated in conformity with the authorization conferred by the military order to convene.

II. Having agreed upon a political Constitution upon which to found an independent, democratic Republic, we are still without a definite agreement as to what the future relations of Cuba and the United States will be, constitutionally. We, the delegates, not having been given legislative faculties, cannot arrange the basis of future relations, such attributes pertaining entirely to the co-legislative bodies.

III. Nevertheless, if the Washington Government, whose discretion and knowledge we recognize, should deem it necessary, we are willing to discuss, agree upon, and present a basis for arrangement of our mutual relations.

IV. Finally: The aspirations of the Convention are merely to consolidate the situation of the country, whose welfare demands her early reconstruction, that all of her energies may be directed toward supporting the policy of the great Republic, to which she is bound by the indestructible ties of gratitude — a policy based upon the unequivocal preservation of liberty and independence throughout the American continent."

Neither of these called out any special enthusiasm or any special criticism. About February 1, *La Nacion* published the following proposals, which were copied and not unfavorably commented upon by other journals:

"That the Republic, for a period of two years after the establishment of independence, will conduct foreign affairs through the United States, will make no treaty with any other nation prejudicial to the United States, and will accept no compromise which might give rise to the occupation of the island or to intervention in its customs.

That the United States, for a period of two years after the establishment of independence, may occupy forts in Cuba, provided the Cuban flag flies with the American.

That Cuba will lease to the United States two coaling stations, and will give no commercial advantages to any other nation which are not given to the United States.

That none of these concessions or promises is to be taken to imply any cessation of the sovereignty of Cuba or any lessening of her complete independence."

At about the same time two long letters appeared in local papers. They bore the signatures of Generals Rius Rivera and José Alemán, both of the ultra-radical party. These, while manifesting no spirit of hostility to the United States, stood upon the issue of Cuba's absolute independence, and argued for an unabridged sovereignty, unabridged as well by the United States as by other powers. Both were received with not a little hostile criticism, as failing to reflect either popular sentiment or the sentiment of the Convention, of which body both gentlemen were members. Much that came to me in private conversation, within and outside the Convention circle, led me to a fixed belief that, without some undue interference or unexpected change of opinion, the Convention would adopt an "opinion" based upon the above project, quoted from *La Nacion*. It might have broadened those lines or it might have narrowed them; but I firmly believe that the main points now at issue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have been conceded, and would have formed at least a basis for further and wholly friendly negotiations. But the interference came, without need and without warrant. It came in a fashion which gave deep offence to a sensitive people; which sacrificed an existing cordiality; and which led to the almost unanimous adoption of an "opinion" which practically places the United States, politically, on a basis with all other nations.

The story of this interference is too long for rehearsal in detail here, yet in it there lies the key to the present situation. It will be remembered that the United States was practically committed to a policy of non-interference in the proceedings of the Convention. For February 15, General Wood had planned an alligator-hunting trip. On the morning of that day an official communication from Washington reached the Palace. It contained a brief outline of President McKinley's idea of Cuban "relations," submitted as a "hint" for the guidance of the Convention. Instead of delaying his excursion or officially submitting the President's communication through its proper channels to the Convention, the Military Governor requested, or summoned, at very brief notice, the President of the Convention and the Relations Committee to accompany him, for thirty miles of railway, upon a part of his trip, to receive that which he had to give them. This may have been democracy; but the Cubans, not without warrant under the circumstances, took it as a discourtesy. They rode the thirty miles, ate a poorer dinner than they would have had at home, and returned at midnight, hurt and offended, to talk about the manner in which suggestions, which they neither wanted nor needed, had been "pitched at" them. They had been assured of freedom of action, and had manifested no disposition to act hastily or foolishly; but here was a "hint," offensively conveyed, that freedom of action meant only freedom of action within certain limitations. The dormant suspicions concerning American good faith were awakened, and the old distrust was revived.

The smart of the first blow still lingered when a second was applied. On February 21, the Military Governor, having a second official communication to make upon the subject of relations, addressed it directly to "Dr. Diego Tamayo, *presidente de comision de relaciones.*" This document contained a "suggestion" from the American President of what he thought the Cubans ought to think the relations between the countries ought to be. In its real effect, it was a request that Cuba should enable the administration to violate legally the Joint Resolution of April, 1898, by accepting, approving, and officially endorsing her resignation of the "free-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom and independence," the right to "government and control," pledged to her in that Resolution. To such a renunciation of that independence which has been the dream and the hope of thousands of Cubans, this document, conveyed semi-privately, "suggested" that the Convention should set its hand and seal. Smarting under these two blows, the Convention, five days later, submitted its own proposals, which were widely at variance in their spirit from either the "hint" or the "suggestion," as well as from that tentative Cuban proposition which, but a few days before, presented fair promise of adoption.

The inclusion of the correspondence and of the documents connected with these proceedings, all of them interesting and some of them important, would involve the production of a volume on this particular incident in Cuban history. This hasty outline has now brought us to the time when the Convention adopted that "opinion" which it had been instructed, by the Military Governor acting for the President of the United States, to "formulate." This was done at two o'clock on the morning of February 27.

The terms of the Platt amendment had already been made public, and copies had been received in Havana. It is wholly probable that some day the American people will regard the passage of that amendment as a hasty and ill-considered act. It is no credit to America that the honor of a great nation and the independence of a small one should be made a subject of political barter in an American Congress. It is no credit to American legislation that after but two hours of debate a law should have been passed to effect that which even the slightest knowledge of the subject would have clearly pointed out as a subject of negotiation and not of legislation. The tangle in Cuba is of American, and not of Cuban, manufacture. The Cubans are no demigods, but they have enough manhood to resent such treatment as has been accorded them.

Had we treated the Cubans as one nation should treat another, particularly as a great and powerful nation should treat a weak and struggling people whom it has befriended and helped, the Cuban Convention would have granted all that could have been asked, and in all probability would have granted it without the asking, had due time been given them to do so before we made peremptory demands upon them. Independence is still with those who give voluntarily, though they give all that which they possess and transfer all right of independent action. To yield territory or to delegate political rights to a stronger power, under coercion in any form, under restraint in any particular, is to become dependent, subject. It is beyond question that the attitude of the authori-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties of the United States has tended to solidify Cuban sentiment. Men who heretofore have stood opposed to the Convention and its purposes are to-day supporting it, believing that their country has suffered a wrong at the hands of its professed benefactors. All will yet be brought to a harmonious and mutually satisfactory conclusion, though months may elapse and many changes arise before that day shall come. But the experience of the opening weeks of the new century will fade but slowly from the Cuban mind. From that experience, and from much that preceded it, the Cuban has learned to distrust the good faith of the American Government.

In closing, I submit a Cuban translation of a Cuban editorial in a Cuban paper. *La Patria* of March 19 thus presents its case:

"Everybody in Cuba regrets it most deeply; but it is incumbent upon us to state very emphatically, that this state of affairs has been brought about exclusively by the United States Government, who attempted to exert pressure upon and coerce the Constitutional Convention into accepting the terms which the United States wanted the Cubans to accept, at the very moment that the Convention was discussing the relations which should exist between the future Government of Cuba and the United States. And, not satisfied with this, in a law, whose object was simply to provide for appropriations, the United States Government suddenly introduces a clause, which attempts to settle, in a precipitate and brutal manner, a question which demands great tact, exquisite prudence, and discretion, in order so to present it that it shall not estrange and divide two nations that should live in the closest harmony and cordiality."

ALBERT G. ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIAN NIHILISM OF TO-DAY.

At an entertainment of a society of Russian revolutionists which I recently attended, on the east side of New York, the singing was all done in subdued voices. When I asked why they did not sing louder, one of the members explained that he and his companions, who were all fresh from their birthplace, had learned their revolutionary airs at the gatherings of secret organizations. "We are accustomed to sing and to conduct our meetings all but in whispers," he said, "because this is the way we do these things at home, where one has gendarmes and spies to guard against."

The larger Russian cities, particularly the university towns and centres of industry, swarm with political detectives; yet the revolutionists manage to print "underground" papers, to hold mass-meetings, and to celebrate the several holidays in the calendar of international socialism. Like the early Christians, or the Spanish Jews in the days of the Inquisition, the Nihilists "worship" in forests and other hiding-places. One of the young men present at the entertainment told how he and his friends had observed the First of May in a pine wood on the outskirts of his native town.

"We marched up and down a clearing some fifty yards in length, stepping softly, almost on tiptoe, and singing revolutionary songs under breath. We had red handkerchiefs with us, too, which we tied to our canes, so as to make them do duty for red flags—the symbol of fraternity. Here it sounds funny, but in Russia, where those who take part in a demonstration of this kind lay themselves open to imprisonment and exile, these things are done in dead earnest. As we marched stealthily along and muttered our socialist songs, our thoughts were in Paris, Brussels, London, or New York, where our brother socialists were at that moment celebrating the same festival openly, without having to fear arrest for doing so. The comparison between our condition and theirs lent special gravity to our poor parade. There was something extremely melancholy in the spectacle, and many of us swore in our hearts to devote our lives to the cause of Russian freedom."

During the few years when "terroristic" Nihilism was at its height, when the revolutionary party was mining railroad tracks over which the Czar was expected to pass, these champions of liberty scarcely managed to publish two "underground" papers. Now the number of revo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lutionary organs, more or less regularly brought out "under the very nose of the gendarmes," is twelve. It is admitted, however, that those who take part in the printing or circulating of these papers do not run the risks which the same sort of work involved in former days. Time was when persons arrested in a secret printing-office were sentenced to long terms of hard labor in the Siberian mines. This, as a rule, actually meant death, within a year or two, from consumption, scurvy, or insanity, in a damp, isolated dungeon in the fortress of Peter and Paul or of Schlüsselburg. The men and women, therefore, who volunteered to set type in the revolutionary printing-establishments of fifteen or twenty years ago took their lives in their hands. Having nothing to lose, they were armed, and when raided by the gendarmes they defended themselves desperately. Thus, when the police had discovered the house where the organ of the terrorists was printed, shortly after the assassination of Alexander II, the firing on both sides lasted about an hour and a half. The case is different with the Nihilists who are connected with the underground Russian press of to-day. The average punishment for an offence of this kind is now about eight years of "free exile" in Siberia; and as there is scarcely a village in Asiatic Russia that has not from twenty to thirty "politicals" among its inhabitants, life in banishment is not half so hard to bear as it used to be. As a consequence, the raiding of a secret newspaper office is never accompanied by bloodshed now; and no sooner does one office fall into the hands of the enemy than another springs up in the same city.

Besides the papers which are printed by the Nihilists at home, they import revolutionary pamphlets from Switzerland and England. These are smuggled across the frontier by a well-organized group of contrabandists, all members of the revolutionary party. The monthly average of pamphlets and tracts reaching Russia by these channels is 50,000. Their distribution is entrusted to an army of workers who go from town to town under various guises, delivering the "goods" in the various "conspiracy houses."

To be sure, many a smuggler or carrier is caught by the political police; but the prisons are so full of Nihilists that instead of keeping them three or four years in preliminary confinement, as the system was formerly, the Government is forced to dispose of their cases with comparative speed, in order to make room for new prisoners. The jails in several cities are so overcrowded that important offenders have often to be transferred to a ramshackle village prison, from which some of them find it easy to escape.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During the last year or two, the revolutionary societies have so grown in boldness that, in several instances, the First of May, or the anniversary of the Paris Commune of 1871, was celebrated by open processions through the streets; whereupon, in some cases, the crowd was so large that the police dared not interfere. A letter, for example, in the last number of a revolutionary paper published in Kieff thus describes the funeral of a socialist named Visotzki, who died in Byelostok:

"About 3,000 working people followed the hearse, and, as we were passing the jail, we began to sing revolutionary songs, to let our comrades within the gloomy building know that the cause for which they are suffering is alive. The coffin was inscribed with the words: 'From socialists to a champion of liberty.' For the first time in the history of our town there appeared in its streets red flags emblazoned with revolutionary mottoes. From the crowds on the sidewalks came shouts of 'Down with despotism!' and 'Long live liberty!' . . . The police dared make only two arrests. . . ."

A similar demonstration is reported from Moscow, where the paraders smashed the windows of the Governor-General, Grand Duke Sergius. Thousands of educated subjects are signing a monster petition asking the Crown for a constitution. All this would have been impossible under the two previous administrations; and the old Nihilists, who hear of these things in their isolated cells in the fortresses, unanimously declare the present movement to be a new chapter in the history of Russian socialism. It seems plain that the city population of the empire has been educated up to a higher sense of civic self-respect; and there are a thousand straws which show that the political wind of Russia blows in the direction of more liberal institutions. Events which have grown out of the recent disturbances in St. Petersburg and Kieff confirm the general opinion that the iron-handed régime of former years, when seventeen-year-old boys were hanged for posting up a revolutionary proclamation, has been abandoned.

While among the inmates of the Siberian prisons there are men who are serving a life sentence for complicity in an unsuccessful attempt upon the life of some inferior official, twenty or twenty-five years ago, Peter Karpovitch, the college student who recently killed Bogolyepoff, the Minister of Public Instruction, was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment only. Logovski, the statistician who shot at Pobyedonostzeff, the actual ruler of Russia, was sent to the mines for six years; whereas Molodetzki, who fired at Loris-Melikoff, the *alter ego* of Alexander II, was hanged forty-eight hours after the attempt.

It cannot be said that the present administration is guided in its domestic policy by a more humane spirit than were the ancestors of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nicholas II; for, indeed, the laws are the same, and Pobyedonostzeff, "the Torquemada of Russia," has an even tighter hold upon the present Czar than he had upon his father. Barring exceptional cases in which the ingrained brutality of the officials crops out in the full force of its Asiatic fury, the authorities simply lack the courage to employ the drastic measures which were in vogue about a decade ago. A striking illustration of the changed mood of the higher bureaucracy is offered by the fate of the recent decree to punish certain college students by forcibly drafting them into the army. As a result of the storm of protestations which the matter called forth, this decree has been put into abeyance; and this, too, after Bogolyepoff, the author of the measure, had been killed by a revolutionist. What a contrast between this state of things and that which prevailed under Alexander III, when the mere signing of a memoir protesting against the abuses of certain officials was punished by exile! Pobyedonostzeff is the same, but the public has gained in dignity.

As a consequence, the "underground terror" which was forced on the old-time Nihilists by the "gendarme terror" of the Government has been discarded. The party of "The Will of the People," whose agents assassinated Alexander II and a score of obnoxious governors, public prosecutors, gendarme officers, and political spies, is practically a thing of the past. The last number of its organ was issued in 1886. About a year later, on the morning of March 13, 1887, the anniversary of the killing of Alexander II, three educated young men stood on Great Sea Street, St. Petersburg, waiting for Alexander III, each with a dynamite bomb under his coat. They had been betrayed, and now they were arrested before the Emperor came in sight. This was the closing event in the brief, but eventful, history of the *Narodovoltzi* (Members of "The Will of the People").

Revolutionary Russia of to-day traces its origin to the political crusades of the seventies and eighties; but it owes its present vitality to a new social factor, and is developing along new lines. It is still an "underground" movement, of course, and as such it necessarily retains many of the traits which characterized the struggle between the plucky *Narodovoltzi* and the Government; but it radically differs from the "circles" of those days in point of methods, as well as in the character and extent of its main field of action.

The killing of the Russian Minister of Public Instruction and the attempt upon the life of the Procurator of the Holy Synod did not form part of an organized movement. Karpovitch was a member of a secret

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization in whose programme acts of violence, as a system, had no room. He was a peaceful educator of the masses, a social-democrat of the German type, a kind-hearted dreamer absorbed in visions of a better world. In a speech which he delivered at his trial he portrayed the retrogressive spirit which Bogolyepoff had introduced in the schools and colleges. When the order was issued condemning university students to penal servitude in the army, he made up his mind to call attention to Bogolyepoff as the embodiment of despotism. "I was not anxious to kill him; I merely wanted to open the eyes of the people," he said.

As to Logovski, he is an ardent follower of Tolstoy, a believer in the doctrine of non-resistance. In his speech before his judges, he dwelt, by way of explaining the contradiction between his creed and the act for which he was on trial, upon his frenzy of indignation at hearing of the order to excommunicate the great novelist. He held Pobyedonostzeff, he said, responsible for the slavery and the woes of the Russian people. He sincerely believed that by removing him he would remove one of the chief causes of the evil.

Unlike the *Narodovoltzi*, who usually proclaimed themselves agents of the terroristic executive committee, and spoke of their mines and bombs as part of a complex scheme to demoralize the Government, by destroying the more obnoxious dignitaries of state, the two men referred to took upon themselves all responsibility for what they had done.

The most significant feature of the recent disturbances, that which furnishes a clew to the entire political situation in the dominions of the Czar, is the participation of large numbers of workingmen in the demonstrations suppressed by the authorities. Despatches from St. Petersburg speak of a "bloody encounter between Cossacks and factory hands," as a result of student riots. The revolutionary press reports open anti-Government demonstrations of secret trade unions. The meaning of it all is that labor forms the rank and file of the revolutionary party of to-day. This is a new and significant departure in the history of Russia's struggle for liberty.

Perhaps the best explanation of the character and meaning of the growing unrest is to be found in a report submitted to the Czar by Trepoff, chief of the political police of Moscow. The document is marked "secret." This, however, did not prevent a copy of it from falling into the hands of the Nihilists, who published it in the "Cause of Labor," a little periodical printed by their agents in Geneva, Switzerland.

"Your Imperial Majesty!" reads the report. "The past history of the revolutionary movement has made it clear that the unaided forces drawn from the intelli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gent classes are unable to carry on a struggle with the Government, even though the educated revolutionists have recourse to explosives. Bearing this in mind, the anti-Government groups heartily applaud the new Social-Democratic agitation, hoping, as they do, to win the laboring masses for their seditious undertakings, and thus to rally a force so large that the authorities will have to take it seriously. Russian revolutionists hastily abandoned their old standards in order to join the new movement. Experience has led them to devote themselves to an indefatigable propaganda among working men along the lines of their daily needs and demands."

The report goes on to draw a parallel between the methods of the earlier Nihilists, whose appeal was lost upon the illiterate masses, and the tactics of the new movement, which addresses itself to the daily interests of the wage workers, taking advantage of every friction between capital and labor:

"The new policy has brought the revolutionists encouraging results. Great labor strikes have come into being which have ended in a way satisfactory to the working people. . . . These triumphs of labor have a dangerous political effect in that they form an elementary school for the revolutionary education of the working people."

As a remedy, the chief of the political police begs the Czar to take the labor question into his own hands:

"The present moment is such a troublous one, the activity of our revolutionists is so intense, that the struggle with this evil calls for the harmonious coöperation of the various government departments."

The real source of the danger to Russian absolutism lies in the industrial growth of the country. While in some instances a strike may be the result of the agitator's persuasion, an epidemic of economic conflicts can scarcely be of such an artificial origin. The occurrences to which the above report alludes are the inevitable upshot of the new industrial conditions. But while industrially Russia is falling into line with the more advanced countries, her political complexion remains unchanged. Such a discrepancy between the economics and the politics of a country cannot last long. It was this kind of discrepancy which in 1848 gave rise to revolutions in France, Germany, and Austria, and to important movements in England.

Trade unions, meetings, and the publication of papers devoted to the interests of labor are strictly forbidden in Russia. To strike means to rebel against the Government. As a consequence, all labor organizations are secret societies, and their revolutionary character is implied by the very nature of their existence. The working people who take part in strikes accuse the Government of siding with their employers. Recently, after some strikers had been shot down by soldiers, the regiment which had taken part in the affair received the personal thanks of the Czar. The story was published in the revolutionary papers; and the result was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the monarch, whom the masses are wont to revere as their "little father," was cursed as an enemy of the people.

As the workingmen clamor for free speech and the right of assemblage, they form the main force in the struggle for constitutional reform. Free speech and the right to hold meetings are just the things the educated classes are coveting. Hence the bond between the two elements of the population; hence the presence of refined men and women side by side with factory proletarians in the recent student riots. Count Tolstoy is not a social-democrat, but the socialist workingmen of Russia have learned, in their secret trade unions, to respect the martyrs of human progress.

Free speech and the right of assemblage were the two principal demands of the *Narodovoltzi* in the letter which they sent to Alexander III after assassinating his father:

"Make it possible for us to educate and uplift the common people, as we started to do in the seventies; grant the country the privileges which every civilized land in the world enjoys; do not bury men and women alive for trying to teach a peasant to read and to think; grant this and we will be glad to lay down our weapons."

Such, in substance, was what the terrorists wrote to the Czar; and Kibalchitch, the man who invented the fatal bomb, said at his trial that if it had not been for the bloodthirsty policy of the Government, he would have devoted himself to the invention not of a machine of destruction, but of something which might facilitate the work of the poor farmer.

These men, who knew how to penetrate into the Winter Palace and to blow up the Czar's dining hall, were comparatively few in number. The party of "The Will of the People" was made up of fifty or seventy-five fearless and able leaders, backed by a few thousand of more or less active propagandists. Almost all of them belonged to the educated classes, and some of their number belonged to the best families in the country. Thus, Sophia Perovskaya, the young woman who played the mistress of the house at the place near Moscow from which an imperial train was blown up by means of an elaborate mine, in 1879, and who gave the signal to fire the bomb which killed Alexander II two years later, was the daughter of a former Governor of St. Petersburg, and a niece of a cabinet minister. True, an active agitation among the workingmen was started by the leading terrorists; and Timothei Michailoff, one of Sophia Perovskaya's co-defendants, a plain workingman himself, explained at the trial that the unfriendly attitude of the Government toward labor was the main cause which drove him into the ranks of the revolutionists. Men like Michailoff were exceptional cases, however. The number of working-people among the *Narodovoltzi* was very small.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nihilistic movement of those days, notwithstanding the noise it made throughout the world, was a head without a body. This accounts for its failure. The Nihilism of to-day has a robust and growing body — the working class; and, although its existence is not proclaimed by the explosion of bombs or mines, the enemies of free institutions watch its movements with greater anxiety than they did the indomitable terrorists.

The term Nihilism, which was once used to denote a certain short-lived school of thought, is seldom applied to the Russian revolutionists in their own country. The propagandists of the seventies, when men and women of education put on peasant garb and went to live the lives of the common people, were known as *narodniki* (peasantists); the terrorists called themselves "Radicals"; while the people connected with the present movement insist upon being called, and are generally referred to as, "Social-Democrats" — a name borrowed from the socialist parties of Western Europe and America, whose teachings form the underlying principle of the Russian revolutionary programme. Like the German followers of Karl Marx, for example, they are opposed to anarchism, in theory as well as in practice. How they look upon the killing of officials or spies is indicated in an editorial in the last issue of their organ, "The Spark." Speaking of Subatoff, the head of political detectives, and of a factory spy who was recently killed in Warsaw, this paper says:

"The terroristic crusade upon spies is the inevitable result of the spy system itself. As long as the working people are compelled to conduct their struggle underground; as long as they are deprived of the right to unite and to defend their interests in open field; as long as each step taken by the champion of justice involves imprisonment or exile; just so long will it be impossible to expect the discontinuance of this sort of terrorism. But the Social-Democracy cannot be carried away by such measures as the killing of spies. Our great hope is for a movement of the whole working class. *Acts of violence can only be the work of individuals, and are of no advantage to a cause which makes for the emancipation of the whole working class.* . . . We cannot be held responsible for the bloody revenge wreaked by some of our comrades upon the Czar's spies; although, on the other hand, we cannot look upon them as criminals, either. To us they are the victims of a despicable order of things, and all our sympathy belongs to those who stake their lives for that which, in their judgment, is beneficial to the cause."

To judge from certain rumors Subatoff's life is in danger. His predecessor, Colonel Sudeikin, carried confusion into the revolutionary organizations by prevailing upon some of the weaker men in their ranks to become spies. One of these, an army officer named Degayeff, a man high in the counsels of the terrorists, betrayed some of the most important members of the party, including Madame Viera Figner, a noble-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman of uncommon beauty and ability, who had been connected with several of the plots upon the life of the Czar, and who is still languishing in one of the casemates of Schlüsselburg. Subsequently, Degayeff became repentant, and offered to atone for his treachery by killing Sudeikin. The offer was accepted on condition that, immediately after assassinating the shrewd detective, Degayeff should leave Russia. The terms of the agreement were fulfilled. Sudeikin was murdered, and Degayeff made his way to the United States. Subatoff has adopted Sudeikin's methods, so the revolutionists predict that he will meet with the same fate.

An interesting feature of the situation is the free rein given to writers with avowed Marxian views on economic and historical questions. While the mildest criticism of the Government's policy is punished by the suspension of the paper printing such strictures, the magazines of St. Petersburg and Moscow and some of the newspapers have, during the last few years, been publishing articles of an avowedly socialistic nature. It is a curious fact that in none of the free countries do the doctrines of Karl Marx receive so liberal a share of attention on the part of the cultured classes as they do in the censor-ridden land of the Czar. The leading authority of the Russian Marxists is George Plekhanoff, formerly the editor of one of the underground papers, and a guiding spirit in the revolutionary "circles" of twenty years ago. He is the actual head of the new movement; and, although he lives in Switzerland, his books, printed under various pseudonyms, have a large circulation in Russia.

To be sure, these books and magazine articles are of a purely theoretical nature, and are looked upon by the Government as innocent academic sport; but they help to leaven the educated part of the population with social-democratic sentiment, and materially aid the new crusade. That sympathy with scientific socialism is "all the rage" just now is shown by the frequency with which the educated Marxist, as a social type, occurs in the recent Russian novels of the better class.

It is scarcely conceivable that the Government is blind to all this. If it continues to allow the publication of the treatises in question — a thing which would have been utterly impossible about ten years ago — the explanation is to be sought in the same political awakening of the urban population which accounts for the comparative leniency which the Government has shown in its treatment of political offenders.

Now and then some high official who fails to realize the spirit of the time will call into play measures which remind one of the reign of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alexander II or III; but he soon finds out his mistake. The recent massacre of students and working people in front of the Kasan Cathedral, St. Petersburg, is a case in point. Private letters of eye-witnesses describe how Cossacks, intoxicated by a lust of blood, similar to that which secured for their "brothers in whips" unenviable fame in Manchuria, "knocked the heads of student-girls against the walls of the church, slashing their faces with their *nagaikas* (whips of braided leather with lumps of lead at the end of them), trampling upon them. . . . Several men and women who saw their relatives and friends thus butchered went insane on the spot." The storm of open indignation which this slaughter of innocent people aroused throughout the land did not, however, fall upon deaf ears. The chief of police was immediately replaced by a less brutal officer; and some of the measures which had called forth the ill-fated demonstration were practically repealed.

The Government has always treated the college students as enemies of the existing order of things; but never did the public take such a bold interest in such matters as it did in the case here referred to. The universities are regarded by the authorities as so many schools of revolution. The Government of the Czar is a government of the tenth century, while the colleges represent European culture of the twentieth; so the conservative powers behind the throne look upon the latter as institutions inimical to the interests of the Crown. As a consequence, conflicts between college boys and the police are quite a common occurrence in Russia. In 1879 the students of the University of Kharkoff were brutally attacked by a detachment of Cossacks acting under orders from Prince Kropotkin, the Governor of the province, a cousin of the well-known scientist and humanitarian who has just completed a lecturing tour in this country. The revolutionists condemned the Governor to death. The fact that his relative was one of the heroes of "underground Russia" did not save him. He was shot dead by a man named Goldenburg, on his way from the theatre. Similar conflicts have taken place almost annually. In a majority of instances the trouble originates in some students getting up a petition asking for some changes in the management of the college; whereupon the signers of the document are usually expelled from the university, or even exiled to Siberia. The sending of educated young men to the army by way of punishment is quite an unusual measure. Under Russian conditions it amounts to hard labor in a penal institution, and has not been practised since the stern days of Nicholas II.

ABRAHAM CAHAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLACE OF THE SENATE IN OUR GOVERNMENT.

ACCORDING to a tradition, more or less authenticated, it was George Washington who remarked that the Senate of the United States was the saucer into which the hot tea of the House of Representatives was poured to cool. Some idea of this kind was certainly in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. Madison suggested that the Senate ought to be so constituted as to protect the opulent minority against the changing, irresponsible, and turbulent majority. Hamilton, who did not believe that the voice of the people was the voice of God, would have had Senators appointed for life. More than one of the Constitution-makers referred to the Senate as the Privy Council of the President; and, almost without exception, they regarded it as the brake of conservatism upon the wheels of national legislation. They found its model in the confederation of Grecian States, "where each city, however different in wealth, strength, or other circumstances, had the same number of deputies and an equal voice in everything that related to the concerns of Greece." The States of the United Netherlands, the Confederated Cantons of Switzerland, and, in some degree at least, the British House of Lords were all replete with suggestion for the constructive statesmen who created the American Senate. And yet, while this is true, the fact remains, as Fisher points out in his "Evolution of the Constitution," that the Senate is really the outgrowth of our own experience. It is the gradual development from the Governor's Council of colonial times. As early as 1769 the members of the Council of Massachusetts were chosen to represent certain localities or great districts, a function still preserved in the representation of each State by two Senators, irrespective of area, wealth, or population.

Within the last few years the Senate of the United States has assumed so dominant a part in national legislation that it becomes interesting and instructive to consider how far the original idea of its establishment has been maintained in the evolution of our government. Washington's quaint and expressive phrase still has some meaning and significance. The Senate is still the conservative branch of the Congress. Its members, elected for six years by State Legislatures, decide national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions with minds less perturbed by fear of popular clamor than the Representatives, whose reëlection, after a brief term of two years, is dependent upon the suffrage of a proverbially fickle public. The Senatorial view is of a wider horizon. It is less subservient to prevailing sentiment, but, it is worth while to note, the register of its judgment has generally been accurate.

Take, for instance, the famous struggle over the so-called Force Bill, a measure passed by a partisan House of Representatives in the first flush of political victory. The contest waged by a skilfully led and determined minority in the Senate resulted in the defeat of the proposed law. The wisdom of that outcome will not, I take it, be seriously questioned to-day. The enactment of the Force Bill would have solidified the South politically, and would have retarded for several decades the material development which has blessed that section. The pouring and cooling process which resulted in its defeat was undoubtedly for the country's good.

Not content, however, with merely refusing to coöperate with the House in the enactment of proposed legislation, or with revising and editing, so to speak, the bills which come to it from the lower body, the Senate of the United States has been responsible, in late years, for numerous measures of great importance. The Wilson Tariff Bill, as framed in the House of Representatives, was discarded by the Senate and a new measure substituted; the latter being accepted by the House with scarcely a whisper of opposition. Identically the same experience befell the resolutions passed by the House declaring that Spain's rule in Cuba was intolerable and not to be endured; while, still more recently, we have seen the Senate originate two of the most important measures ever enacted by Congress — the amendments to the Army Appropriation Bill, one of which bestowed upon the President absolute authority to govern the Philippines, while the other outlined the conditions precedent to the withdrawal of the American troops from Cuba. These amendments, fraught with consequences of the most far-reaching character, were adopted bodily by the House of Representatives after the briefest possible consideration. From the moment that the Senate engrafted these amendments upon the Army Bill, it was a foregone conclusion that the House would swallow them without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

It must not be supposed that the Representatives themselves are either ignorant of or indifferent to this condition of affairs. On the contrary, one of the most emphatic, not to say passionate, speeches in the closing hours of the last Congress was a protest by Representative Cannon, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, against the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arrogance of the Senate in assuming to dictate to the House in the matter of legislation. And yet the House is, in itself, largely responsible for the very situation against which it rebels. When under Mr. Reed rules were enacted which made the Speaker of the House the autocrat of Congress the decadence of the House began. The members, individually and collectively, surrendered themselves into the keeping of one man, who wields a despotism as complete as that of the proverbial Czar. It is the Speaker who appoints the committees, arranging their personnel so as to secure harmony with his own views; it is the Speaker who, as the deciding member of the Committee on Rules, determines whether the House shall or shall not consider certain measures; and, finally, it is the Speaker to whom each Representative must appeal for recognition upon the floor of the House. The individual member, unless he be the favored appointee to some prominent committee chairmanship, is rarely a factor in the proceedings of the House. The concentration of power in the Speaker's hands has practically destroyed all personality. Indignant constituencies have sent back to private life for apparent inefficiency members who were never accorded an opportunity to prove their worth. Their political existence has been crushed out beneath the Juggernaut of despotic rules. The Washington correspondents, who are trained to observe the trend of national events, fully realize the change which has come over the House. There was a time, years ago, when every newspaper representative in the National Capital appreciated the necessity of acquainting himself with the temper of the House upon every important proposition. To-day the labor is unnecessary. If the correspondent knows the attitude of the Speaker the problem is at once solved.

It is worth while to understand this situation thoroughly, because, it seems to me, it explains the loss of prestige which the House has sustained and the importance which the Senate has assumed. In the Senate the individual is supreme. Any Senator may address the presiding officer and secure recognition at any time when the floor is not occupied by a colleague. He can offer a resolution upon any subject, and, through admirable rules, can place the Senate upon record as to its disposition. If the majority of the Senate desires to send the resolution to some committee crypt, where it shall remain buried until the campaign, for instance, is safely over, the reference is secured only after a yea-and-nay vote. If the resolution goes upon the calendar, any Senator can at any time move that the Senate proceed to its consideration—a question which must be determined without debate. This again places the Senate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon record, and is a proceeding absolutely unknown in the House. Thus, in the closing hours of the last Congress, Senator Jones, of Arkansas, the leader of the Democratic minority, proved a thorn in the side of the Republican party by demanding consideration of his resolution discharging the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the Anti-Trust Bill. The effort was not successful, the Republican majority voting solidly in the negative; but Senator Jones had placed the responsibility where it belonged. Almost every day the record is made up in the Senate upon some test question, because the right of the individual is not abridged or restricted.

This preëminence of the individual in the Senate of the United States goes to a remarkable and much-criticised extent. As long as any Senator desires to speak upon any bill under consideration, just so long must hearing be accorded and a vote postponed. This is what is popularly known as unlimited debate. It is the one thing which makes the Senate absolutely unique in legislative bodies. Only recently the River and Harbor Appropriation Bill failed to reach a final vote, because a Senator occupied the floor during the last thirteen hours of the session, ostensibly criticising the measure, but, in reality, talking against time, with the knowledge that when the hands of the clock reached the hour of noon, Congress would expire by limitation, and the bill would die. This performance, extremely irritating to Senators who were interested in the generous appropriations of the bill, has led to a renewal of previous efforts to amend the rules of the Senate, so as to provide for closure, under certain conditions.

These endeavors have failed in the past, and there is no reason to anticipate success in the future. They ought to fail. Under no circumstances ought there to be limitation of debate in the Senate of the United States. It is the only forum where great and grave public questions can be thoroughly and exhaustively discussed. This high position, once held by the House, has been abdicated by that body. We have seen a bill which proposed a complete revision of the tariff, considered in the House for a few days and then passed, when only a score of pages, out of two or three hundred, had received attention. Crude, ill-digested, and lacking all sense of proportion, the measure has been hastily sent to the Senate, with all its imperfections upon its head. Provisions which were of questionable propriety escaped criticism, because they were buried in the pages which were not reached; and, for the same reason, important amendments, upon which the House was anxious to vote, remained unoffered upon the members' desks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Very different was the course pursued in the Senate, where a rule arbitrarily fixing a day and an hour when a vote must be taken is a thing unknown. Conscious that it could not be hampered, the minority at once prepared to assert itself. It proceeded deliberately to question the Chairman of the Finance Committee as to the reasons which influenced the figures of each schedule, and the answer was necessarily forthcoming. If the reply was not satisfactory or convincing, there was a possibility that the error might be remedied; or, if no alteration was allowed by the majority, the explanation and the action went upon the record, to be read and judged by all men. In the case of the McKinley Bill the Democrats were the inquisitors; while, when the Wilson tariff measure was under consideration, the Republicans assumed the offensive. In both instances several weeks were occupied in the discussion — a period during which there was much criticism of the deliberation of the Senate. The result, however, in each case, proved the wisdom of delay, for the proposed law was vastly improved before its final enactment. The tariff measures which bear the names of McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley, were largely framed in the Senate, while the same is true of the law recently passed to reduce the taxation imposed during the war with Spain.

The value of unlimited debate in the Senate has been so completely established in innumerable instances that it hardly seems worth while to continue an argument in its favor. On the other hand, it will be urged, and with truth, that many measures have been prevented from reaching a final vote because their opponents have talked them to death. It is equally true, however, that no measure ever failed of enactment which had behind it a persistent, earnest majority, supported by public opinion. The defeat of the Force Bill is often cited as a thwarting of the will of the majority of the Senate; but the fact is that, during the long struggle over that measure, the minority became a majority, and the Force Bill was finally displaced by a proposition looking to the free coinage of silver. In the last Congress the Ship Subsidy Bill failed to reach a vote; but there never was, at any time, a solid Republican support for that measure. Some Republican Senators openly opposed it; others gave it only a half-hearted assistance; and many others encouraged the Democrats who planned and executed the campaign of debate. The discussion exposed many of the inequalities, injustices, and iniquities of the measure; so that when the subject is considered at the next session of Congress a more satisfactory bill will be enacted.

And this brings to mind another fact. All the great issues of recent political campaigns have been formulated through Senatorial debates.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is especially true of the silver question, which leaped into national prominence through the three-months' struggle over the repeal of the Sherman Silver-Purchasing Law. In those three months the financial problem was debated as it never had been, and never could be, in the House; and it is worth while emphasizing the fact that if the bill had been brought to a vote immediately after being reported to the Senate, it would have been defeated. The prolongation of the debate secured the majority necessary for its passage. In the Senate, and in the Senate alone, has the Philippine question received that thoroughness of examination to which it is entitled; and the same might be said of every other important issue before the country.

The power of the individual is still further demonstrated in the Senate of the United States through the fact that nearly all minor legislation is enacted by unanimous consent; the objection of a single Senator being generally fatal to the passage of any bill. This is a tremendous power to lodge in an individual even though he be a Senator of the United States; but it is to the credit of the members of the Senate that the privilege is rarely, if ever, abused. Objections are, of course, not infrequent; but when they are met by amendments or satisfactory explanations, they are almost invariably withdrawn. In the closing days of a session unanimous consent is absolutely essential to the consideration of any measure. While this may result in the failure of some laudable propositions, the statute books are also protected against the imposition of much unwise and hasty legislation. The Senator who objects does so publicly, and is answerable to his own conscience and to his constituency for his action. If he thus records his opposition, it is safe to assume that he believes himself to be acting wisely; and experience proves that Senators are restrained from undue objection by a wholesome regard for the sentiments of their colleagues. It would have been in the power of Senator Tillman, for instance, to have blocked all legislation as soon as he had learned that his much-desired appropriation of $250,000 for the Charleston exposition had been sacrificed. But, as a matter of fact, he did nothing of the kind. He could not have stood up against the torrent of indignation which would have been poured out upon him. Senator Carter, it is true, did defeat the River and Harbor Bill; but he was fully aware that in so doing he was acting in harmony with the sentiment of many of his colleagues, who regarded the bill as extravagant and harmful. If it had not been for the existence of this feeling, Mr. Carter never would have dared to take his stand in opposition, even though he was about to retire to private life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In its own way, the Senate accomplishes more work — that is, it enacts more bills — than the House of Representatives. No Senator objects for the mere sake of objecting; because he is aware that if he is captious, he will himself encounter innumerable stumbling-blocks when he seeks the passage of measures in which he is interested. He is only one of ninety Senators, any one of whom has every privilege which he enjoys. It is the fact that each Senator is a power unto himself that gives the Senate its peculiar place in our system of government. When a vote upon a treaty or an important measure is to be canvassed, it is necessary to know the individual view of each Senator, a task frequently surrounded with some difficulty. There is more independence of thought and action in the Senate than in the House. Instances where two Senators of the same political party from the same State vote upon opposite sides of the same question are by no means rare, and, of late years, have become quite common. Party leaders, therefore, take occasion, during the days occupied in a prolonged debate, to investigate the condition of their own ranks, and strengthen, by such pressure as may be most effective, any weakness they may discover. The very necessity for this preliminary canvass emphasizes the individuality of each Senator, and makes him a power to be courted or feared.

The right of any Senator to speak at any time, upon any subject, and at any length, develops orators and debaters. No man who possesses a talent in this direction need lack for opportunity to prove his capacity. If he is really a great orator, if he actually demonstrates his logical and thoughtful mind, he forges to the front, and must be reckoned with by those who assume leadership. If, on the other hand, he is dull and slow-witted, lacking both strength of thought and forcefulness of expression, he will sink by his own weight. The right to speak cannot be denied him, but he will not command an audience; and very promptly will he recognize that he has ceased to be a factor of importance. In olden times, a new Senator maintained silence for a year or two before affording his colleagues an opportunity to judge of his capacity. He familiarized himself with his surroundings; he felt the ground securely under his feet, so to speak, before he essayed to venture into public notice. The début of a Senator was in those days a noteworthy event. It was his crucial test; and it was not without some fear and trembling that he invited the verdict of his colleagues. Nowadays, however, in the haste and rush of modern legislation, few Senators undergo the term of probation which was formerly customary. They plunge at once into the vortex of debate. Sometimes they emerge safely and creditably; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more frequently they are carried underneath the surface, and in subsequent obscurity pay the penalty of their rashness.

Within the last few years some rich men have secured seats in the Senate, with comparative ease, through the manipulation of State politics; and their presence has given that body the nickname of "The Millionaires' Club." As a matter of fact, a large majority of the Senators are poor men. This is especially true of those who represent Southern States, who are proverbially lacking in plenitude of this world's goods. The millionaires in the Senate can be counted upon ten fingers. Some of them are notoriously rich, like Clark, of Montana, while large fortunes are undoubtedly possessed by Hanna, of Ohio; McMillan, of Michigan; Elkins, of West Virginia; Kearns, of Utah; Proctor, of Vermont; Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Turner, of Washington; Platt and Depew, of New York; and Wetmore, of Rhode Island. To two-thirds of the Senators the annual salary of $5,000 is a consideration not to be despised. There are few perquisites to eke out this comparatively meagre compensation — none, in fact, worth mentioning. The Government provides one or two clerks to attend to the Senator's correspondence, which is always heavy; it allows a minimum of free stationery; and it returns some of his travelling expenses.

There is opportunity, of course, to make money through speculation; and some Senators avail themselves of it. One Senator, who was a large holder of Washington real estate, increased its value very materially by steering legislation for street improvements in its direction; while every manipulation of tariff schedules and of internal revenue taxation, affecting steel and iron, tobacco, whiskey, and sugar, reveals the close connection between the Senate of the United States and Wall Street. But this acquisitiveness, to call it by no harsher name, is, after all, confined to the few Senators who are noted for their commercial instincts. The majority of Senators do not speculate. They content themselves with their modest salary; and how they manage to live upon it is a daily wonder. The demands upon the Senatorial purse are incessant. Every Senator is persistently approached by stranded constituents, who expect, and generally receive, financial assistance. Unless he elects to live in absolute retirement, it is also incumbent upon him to maintain some social position. Occasionally a Senator will come to Washington with the idea that he can be something or somebody upon $5,000 a year. It does not take many months to show him the futility of the effort. In fact, it is impossible for a Senator to save anything from his salary, unless he hides in a back street, burying himself like a hermit, neither

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entertaining nor being entertained. In the diplomatic service, the leading ambassadorial positions are bestowed upon men whose *entourage* can be maintained by their private fortunes; and the time does not seem to be far distant when the Senate of the United States will be composed in large degree of rich men, simply because a poor man cannot afford to accept the position.

It is to the credit of the Senate that wealth is not yet the standard by which its members judge each other. There are millionaires in the Senate who occupy insignificant places, who are never consulted by their colleagues, and who simply follow where others lead. On the other hand, men who possess brains are consequential factors in determining legislation, although in material wealth they may be as poor as church mice. A man cannot rise to eminence in the Senate by wealth alone. Herein, it seems to me, is much basis for felicitation. Until this condition changes, the Senate will continue to be, what it is to-day, the greatest legislative body in the world. Of course, the time may come when the sordid influences which measure a man by the size of his bank account may control the Senate. Let us, at least, be thankful that this time has not yet arrived; and let us hope, for the sake of the Republic, that it will never come.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KAISER'S SPEECHES AND GERMAN HISTORY.

ALL Germany is up, in her daily press, against the recent strange pronouncements of Emperor William II. It is not many months since he startled and shocked public opinion by declaring that "no quarter is to be given," in the coming battles in China, and by his reference to the Etzel, or Attila, of the Nibelungen Lied. Not less extraordinary were his remarks about the blessings of culture which he said the ancient Romans had conferred upon Germany, when, in a kind of Cæsarean festival on the Saalburg, he revived, and was present at, a theatrical mummery, in the classic style of ancient Imperial Rome. Quite recently, to the astonishment of all, and without any apparent cause whatever, he announced, in a speech to a German regiment which takes its name from Czar Alexander, that if Berlin were to rise again, as in 1848, "in disobedience to its King," it would be put down by force of arms in the most vigorous manner.

I may mention, to the honor of the German press, that in regard to this latter harangue there has been universal disapproval and utter amazement, from the most Radical, or Socialistic journals, to the most moderate ones. Barring some ultra-reactionist paper here and there, which has always advocated violent measures of the Russian autocratic kind, there is such a unanimity of criticism of that incomprehensible threat as has never been the case since the present ruler's accession. Even journals known to receive semi-official communications from the highest Government quarters have joined in the chorus of wondering disapprobation.

Now, let us glance rapidly, in the light of history, at the several utterances just referred to. Here, a speech made in the Reichstag by the War Minister, Herr von Gossler, in support of his Imperial master, must be quoted. "What our troops are now doing in China," he said, "is only the revenge for what the Huns did among us for centuries!"

An amazing statement, truly. So it seems to be the duty of a highly civilized nation to avenge, by torrents of blood, after more than a thou-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sand years, what barbarians from further Asia had once done to its forebears![1]

Furthermore, Herr von Gossler, evidently speaking in the Kaiser's name, wrongly mixes up the earlier Huns with the later Magyars, against whose invasions Germany had also to contend. Were those Magyars, perchance, simply Chinese? A little more learning might be of advantage to a War Minister who thus preaches sanguinary retaliation at the distance of a thousand years. Why, the Hungarians of the present day are the best allies of the German Empire in the Triple Alliance!

The Kaiser seems, moreover, to be unaware that the Etzel of our Nibelungen Lied is very different from the historical Attila. No doubt, Etzel, in our national epic, has replaced the notorious "Scourge of God," as Attila was called; for both had their court on the Lower Danube. But any one who has studied the connection of the Nibelungen tale with the Edda, in which are preserved ancient German songs, that would else have been lost, must know that originally the whole Siegfried tale, including the death of Siegfried, was located on the Lower Rhine; that of yore, according to the Edda, a King Atli ruled there, who took for his spouse the widow of Siegfried, a German Hunic (not Hunnic) prince; but that after the great migrations, when a chaotic mixture of tribes and tales took place, the Mongolic Hunns, by a misunderstanding of words and names, were inserted in the German Nibelung story, instead of the Teutonic Hunes, after whom the Hunsrück mountain and many other places are still named to this day. Then, too, Atli, the German ruler on the Lower Rhine, was changed into an Attila — or Etzel, as the form of that name is in High German speech; and the story of the revenge, after the murder of Siegfried, was transferred from the Rhine to the Danube.

The traces of this transformation are still visible in our epic. The Etzel of the Nibelungen Lied is not a cruel barbarian, like the Scourge of God, but a "noble prince," a "noble king." The water nixes in the Danube are called mermaids (*merewîjo*), because, in the original tale, they hail from the Netherlands, near the shores of the German Ocean. Any one speaking of the Etzel of the Nibelung Lay should be clear about the difference in character between him and the Mongolic, Hunnic Attila of history. But enough of this. Let us now turn to the Romans.

Were the doctrine of revenge and retaliation, such as the Kaiser and

[1] But even then the historical question arises: Are the Huns of Attila, after all, synonymous with the Chinese? Do not, on the contrary, many scholars of the first rank maintain that the ancestors of the Huns, who harried Germany, Gaul, and Italy, were the Hiong-nu, who, in the early centuries of our era, waged war against the Chinese?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Herr von Gossler preach, to be considered right for that which happened a thousand or more years ago, how should we have to look upon the festival on the Saalburg, as organized by William II? Suppose Armin — or Hermann, as we usually, though wrongly, call him — the Liberator of Germany from the Roman yoke, who overthrew Varus in the Teutoburg forest, could suddenly have made his appearance on the ruins of that old Roman stronghold. What would he have said? Suppose the stones of the fortress could speak, the fortress which was erected for the purpose of robbing our ancestors of their independence, to impose upon them the laws and the language of an insatiable conqueror who pushed his World Empire as far as the land of the Britons — a country then divided, according to the Latin expression, from the whole circle of the earth (*toto divisos orbe Brittannos*).

Had the object of that structure on the Taunus range been attained, no document in the Latin language, or any address in that tongue, need have been composed by Mommsen, or by Herr Schulze, the director of a grammar school, on the occasion of those festivities; for we Germans should, in that case, all speak to-day a daughter-language of Latin. Yet, Emperor William, glorifying the deeds of Imperial Rome, actually exclaimed in his harangue:

"Here we see now, on the heights of the Taunus, arisen anew, like a phœnix from its ashes, the old Roman castle, a witness of Roman power, a link in the mighty iron chain which the legions of Rome put around the colossal Empire, forcing the will of Rome, at the bidding of a single Imperator, Cæsar Augustus, upon the world, and opening the whole world to that Roman culture which fell fertilizing before all, upon Germany."

Well, we know, or, at least, we all ought to know, how this was effected. Tacitus has recorded what was done near the Taunus for carrying civilization into our country. Cæsar Germanicus, the noble warrior, who captured Thusnelda, the wife of Armin, and led her in triumph as a prisoner into Rome, raised, before he perpetuated this grand deed, a stronghold on the Taunus, in the place of one that had been built by his father. He then "fell upon the Chattians (Hessians) with such unexpected suddenness that all those who were weak, owing to sex or age, were at once captured or slaughtered." In other words, neither women, children, nor old men were spared. Thus, in more than Hunnic manner, our ancestors were treated by that conquering power which seemed to be bent upon proving that it had grown from a wolfish suckling.

Germanicus generally passes for one of the noblest of Romans. Yet such was his usual procedure against the Germans. Tacitus writes:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"He wasted the country by fire and sword to the extent of fifty miles. Neither sex nor age found mercy. Sacred places, and ordinary dwellings, without distinction, even the Temple of Tamfana, the special resort of those nations, were levelled to the ground. The Roman soldiers massacred men who were half asleep, unarmed, or scattered about, whilst they themselves remained unwounded."

That was the famous struggle with the German Marsians between the Ems and the Lippe. They had caroused during a festival, and were fallen upon, by the Romans who massacred them, as they lay stretched, here and there, upon their beds, or near their tables, in perfect security; no watch having been stationed by them anywhere, and no fear of a hostile attack existing among them. In the languor of their inebriated condition they were simply butchered.

At the Weser river this highly cultured Cæsar Germanicus acted in the same way in the struggle against Armin and Inguiomar. In accordance with Roman custom, Gallic and Germanic troops were put, in battle, in the forefront. Of his own countrymen's behavior Germanicus was, however, not sure. So he disguised himself, by hanging a deer-skin on his shoulders, in order to appear like a German auxiliary; and thus, without an attendant, he went by a secret path, where there were no sentinels, round the camp, eagerly listening to what the soldiers were saying. When one of the enemy, who understood Latin, rode up to the entrenchments and with a loud voice made offers to those who would go over to Armin, the answer came from the indignant ranks of the legions that

"the Roman soldiers would give battle, and then take the lands of the Germans, and lead away their wives by right of conquest; for they looked upon the wealth and the women of the enemy as their destined prey."

Such were the seeds of culture that fell fertilizing, according to William II, upon the soil of Germany from the hands of Imperial Rome.

Not less instructive is the account Tacitus gives of the battle that followed. The Germans had neither helmet nor coat of mail. They had only shields made of twigs, and were otherwise indifferently armed. Nevertheless, thanks to their bravery, the unequal struggle lasted from nine in the morning until night, and "this slaughter of the foe filled the country for ten miles with corpses and weapons." Then the soldiers saluted Tiberius as Imperator, upon the field of battle, and heaped up the German arms, after the manner of trophies.

Still, the wrath of our forebears, fighting, against such odds, for their independence and freedom, was only increased by such treatment. Forthwith they renewed the struggle. "They grasp their weapons; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common people, the nobles, the young, the aged, all rush suddenly upon the Roman army on its march, and throw it into confusion." In order to encourage his troops, Germanicus, to be more easily known, pulled off his helmet, and

"admonished his men to continue the slaughter. They wanted no prisoners. The extermination of the people alone would put an end to the war. As it was late in the day, he drew off a legion to pitch the camp. The others glutted themselves till night with the blood of the enemy. The cavalry fought with doubtful success."

No prisoners are to be made. With the blood of the foe the Roman soldiers are to glut themselves. The German people must be exterminated. These were the blessings of civilization which the much-praised Germanicus was to bring to our country. And a Kaiser of to-day celebrates the performance by an oratorical pæan!

But things were to happen differently from what the Roman general imagined. Presently, his attempt to take back the greater part of his troops on a fleet through the German Ocean, led, owing to the perils of the stormy sea, to such losses, and wrecks, and dreadful sufferings, that he alone reached the coast of the Chaucians with his galley. There, during the whole time of his stay, "he reproached himself, day and night, as the author of such wholesale destruction, and could hardly be kept by his friends from ending his own life in that same sea."

In one of these battles, Armin and Inguiomar were saved by Chaucian mercenaries in the Roman army, who recognized them, but nevertheless let them through, when they fought their way, in retreat, on horseback. For, among the German mercenaries who had become faithless to their fatherland, not a few often left the ranks of its enemies on decisive occasions. The traitor Segest, the father-in-law of Armin, who handed over his own daughter to the Romans as a captive, and who had even once put Armin in chains, in order to please the "divine Augustus," from whom he had received civic rights at Rome, remained faithful to the foreign oppressor. The wretched knave may be seen in the famous picture of Piloty, hiding in the shade, at the triumphal entry of Germanicus, when Thusnelda, Armin's wife, was led along, as a prisoner, together with her little son Thumelik, and a number of chieftains. Strabo, the Greek historian, gives these details; for the statement of Tacitus, that the Greeks knew nothing of the Liberator of Germany, is a mistake.

If Armin could have appeared on the Saalburg! What would have been his feelings in the presence of all that theatrical apparition of Romans in martial array and in the toga; of wreath-crowned boys, scattering flowers and swinging censers; of "*Salve Imperator*" songs and Latin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harangues; of Roman priests and generals, and Germanic chieftains or princes who had sold themselves to the country's enemy — as unfortunately also happened even in later centuries in our history?

Did not, however, Segest's son, Segimund, once tear the Roman sacerdotal fillets from his own head and go over to the defenders of his fatherland, until his traitorous father made him join the country's enemy once more? How Armin flew about among his Cheruscans, calling them to arms against Segest and Germanicus! "Oh, what a noble father! Oh, what a great general! What a brave army, whose numerous hands have carried off a helpless bit of a woman!" So the Liberator exclaimed with mocking admonition. How he fired and animated the Germans against the traitorous fellow Segest, who "had been the guilty cause of their having seen, between the Rhine and the Elbe, the Roman rods and axes, and the toga!" How he stormed against these so-called bringers of culture, who, with executions and the enforcement of tribute, had thrown other nations into an infamous servitude!

Thus the Liberator spoke; and thus again he shouted, in wrathful language, across the Weser, when speaking to his brother Flavus, the golden-haired Cheruscan, who had lost an eye in battling for Roman dominion. In the name of the fatherland, in the name of the time-honored, inherited freedom of the Germans, of their own Gods, and of their mother, who hoped that a son of hers would not become a traitor to his kinsmen and his race, Armin conjured the brother to come over to their country's cause. He spoke, or rather shouted, partly in his native German tongue, partly in Latin, so that the Roman warriors, standing away in the rear of Flavus, might also understand his words. At last, the two, coming to mutual insult, became so angry that even the dividing Weser would not have prevented them from fratricidal single combat, had not the leader of the Roman cavalry, Stertinius, held back Flavus, who, full of rage, was calling for his weapons and his horse, whilst on the opposite side Armin, amidst furious threats, was challenging him to battle.

Are we to forget all that Imperial Rome, which built up a World Empire on the ruins of nationalities, which kept no treaty-faith, and shrunk back from no cruel misdeed, perpetrated against our ancestors? Yea, even the stones of the Saalburg speak of it. Or are we, on the other hand, to take revenge upon the Italians of to-day, with whom we are at peace, amity, and alliance? What a colossal folly that would be!

In my opinion, it would have been more fitting to let the Saalburg, that ancient Roman Zwing-Uri, continue to lie in ruins, and to erect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

near it a place, a museum, for the collection of the objects found near the spot. The Romanizing, Imperializing, theatrical mummery which was arranged by the court of Berlin ought not to have taken place. It is not worthy of the historical recollections I have above given of the struggles for German independence and freedom.

Could we possibly imagine that in England, where there is no lack of Roman ruins, a similar celebration would be held to that ordained by William II? Who in England would have dared to organize a masquerade of ancient Romans, and of British chieftains serving under them, with Latin harangues in honor of Victoria, *Regina et Imperatrix*, or of King Edward, *Rex et Imperator?* And yet, such a festivity would not even affect the dignity of the Anglo-Saxon race from which Englishmen hail; for Roman dominion in Britain preceded the conquest of that country by German tribes. A festivity of that kind would, consequently, only typify the rule of the Romans over the aboriginal Keltic and Iberian population of a country which takes its present name from the German Angles.

Or could we imagine that the Italians would institute a similar celebration in honor of the Kimbrians and the Teutons, of the Marcomans and the Alemanns, of the Goths and the Lombards, who invaded, or even settled in, Italy? Is it thinkable that the Italians would, for such a purpose, put on helmets decorated with the open jaws of terrible wild beasts; that they would carry white, shining shields, double-edged javelins, and large, broad swords, such as Plutarch describes the armament of the Teutonic invaders to have been; and that, on the occasion of such a celebration, harangues would be addressed in Gothic to the King of Italy?

A World Empire Rome had become; and tyrants, criminals, libertines, and madmen arose in it. It was indeed a real World Empire with no other by its side. It lasted until the assault of German tribes brought about its fall. *That* was an historical revenge and retaliation.

The later struggles for German dominion in Italy, in opposition to the Papal claim of universal dominion, might even be interpreted as a continuation of this historical revenge. The Papacy — as Gibbon has it — sat, like a ghost, on the ruins of the preceding Roman World Power; and Rome continued its pretensions, though in priestly garb. In those struggles, however, our own unity as a nation came to grief. Our ancient liberties were broken down more and more. The Barbarossas and their ilk found greater pleasure in a Roman *Lex Majestatis* than in the bold speech to which Germans, as a people, were accustomed — a boldness still observable in Luther as well as Hans Sachs, the head of the Meister-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

singers. Only read what Luther, in the beginning of his career, said about tyrannical princes in his own country. Or read what cautious Melanchthon complained of in regard to the "all too free speech of Germans," as he called it in his timorous disposition. What would become of any one in the Germany of to-day who ventured to speak out as Luther and Hans Sachs did against oppressive princes?

Now, let us turn to the most recent harangue of William II, in which — imitating, in this, his grandfather — he suddenly came out with incomprehensible threats about any possible renewal of the revolutionary rising of 1848. Here I shall first quote a letter from a Berlin correspondent whose views are far removed from advanced Liberalism even — not to mention democratic principles. He writes:

"The Kaiser has made a grave mistake. Because, a short time ago, a crazy woman at Breslau, and now a half-witted young workingman at Bremen, have done a thing for which, as the doctors declare, neither of them can be held mentally responsible — is that a reason for the Head of the State to declare war, so to say, against the population of Berlin? Who dreams, in the capital of the German Empire, or anywhere in the country, of a rising by force of arms? Are such wild assertions calculated to strengthen our position in regard to foreign Powers in the West and the East? The Emperor says he is convinced that he 'would be victorious, even though we are surrounded by foes, and though we shall have to fight, as a minority, against a majority of enemies.' But is it wise thus to paint on the wall dangers from abroad and dangers from within? He calls out that 'there lives a powerful ally of his — that is, the good old God in Heaven, who ever since the time of the Great Prince Elector and of the Great King (Frederick II) has always been on our side.' Has the Kaiser then forgotten that, thanks to our internal divisions in the beginning of this century, we were overrun by Napoleon I and kept practically for years under a foreign yoke, and that no help came from what he is pleased to call his 'ally'?"

The letter also deals with the complaint of William II that "the spirit of brutality is on the increase among the youth of the country." Here the writer observes:

"But was it wise to say this so shortly after certain speeches, in which the memory of Attila was called up, for the purpose of preaching revenge upon the Chinese kinsmen of the Huns after the lapse of fifteen hundred years, and declaring that 'no quarter must be given'? Is a spirit of humanity thus to be promoted, and brutality to be kept in check? I am afraid all these utterances are only making for evil, while the Emperor asserts that he is combating the 'evil spirit of the times.' It is a pity that he saps in this way his own position. There is already too much alienation between the masses and himself on account of South African affairs, in which he has so entirely veered around as to offend, I may literally say, the whole nation. He really cannot afford to continue making enemies among all classes and all parties by these menaces of shooting down his own Berliners, 'if they were to repeat their rebellious disobedience of 1848.' People now bring to mind that some years ago he spoke of the duty of soldiers to kill their own fathers and brothers, if need be, in such a struggle, and everybody asks: 'What does it all mean?' It is too sad for words!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have given these extracts because they come from one who would even resent being considered an adherent of democratic views. At the same time he feels what Prussia and Germany at large owe to the grand national movement of 1848–49, in which so much precious blood of men of all classes and ranks was spilt, and so many were martyred by imprisonment and exile. Even the most moderate men now acknowledge, if they are not bereft of all feeling of justice and of all logic, that without the stirring events of those years, the later revival of the country, its attainment of whatever unity, freedom, and social progress it possesses at present, would have been impossible.

From the downfall of her Empire in 1806, through the Napoleonic invasion, Germany was, until 1848, a mere loose Confederation of Princes, each pretending to absolute sovereignty within his dominion, however large or small. Since the old Reichstag, or common parliament, had been abolished, there was no national representation for the Fatherland. The smaller kingdoms and principalities had local diets, but without practical power. Austria and Prussia were without any parliaments at all! The press was gagged and kept under censorship. Except on the left bank of the Rhine, there was no trial by jury. A German was virtually a stranger in every other German state than the one he had been born in. He could be expelled from all other states. Criminal offences of all kinds were investigated and adjudged in secret. The police were all-powerful. The so-called Diet of Frankfort, the central authority of Germany, including both Austria and Prussia, as well as the minor states, was composed of the official delegates of monarchs. It simply formed a superior committee of Political Police, issuing laws and ordinances of the most oppressive and arbitrary kind. There was no right of free meeting. Patriots who aimed at a national and free reconstitution of the common Fatherland were thrown into dungeons, and frequently driven, by downright torture, to commit suicide. Czar Nicholas I exercised a decisive influence upon German princes. The harsh foreign dominion in the German Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, whose old constitution had been overthrown, had to be borne without the prospect of remedy.

Then came the great upheaval which William II now attacks as a "disobedience to a king." In every German state the people rose with arms in hand, or by "storm petition," as it was called. Austria and Prussia obtained parliaments of their own. A National Assembly, or Reichstag, was convoked in Frankfort, the old free city where Emperors were formerly elected for life. In that Assembly, Freiherr von Gagern, as speaker, a very moderate Liberal, literally proclaimed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sovereignty of the people. In that parliament sat the deputies of Prussia, of the federal German provinces of Austria, and of all the minor states, including Schleswig-Holstein, whose people had also risen and formed an army of their own. The freedom of the press, the right of meeting, trial by jury, religious liberty — all the rights of citizenship and of personal freedom which exist in truly constitutional countries — were proclaimed. A German was henceforth a citizen all over the common Fatherland. A beginning was made of a national navy. Though by a narrow majority — the minority being largely imbued with Republican principles — the reconstruction of the Empire was decreed, and the crown offered to the then King of Prussia, Frederick William IV. He, who afterward ended as a lunatic, refused it. In the final struggle which thereupon ensued, the National Parliament and its executive, which had sought refuge at Stuttgart, were dissolved by force of arms. After many battles in the open field in southwestern Germany, the vanquished popular parties were punished by bloodthirsty courts-martial, by mass imprisonments, by confiscation of property, and by exile.

Nevertheless, it was the spirit of 1848–49, which some twenty years later fired the German nation in the war of defence against the aggression of Napoleon III. Then the very Prince, William I of Prussia, who had cruelly helped in overthrowing the movement of 1848–49, and had court-martialled many of the best patriots, was compelled to make a change of policy in the progressive sense. A German Parliament was restored. The different states — which even after the defeat of the Revolution had retained their parliamentary institutions, the freedom of the press, trial by jury, etc. — were combined into a closer union. The King of Prussia was elected German Emperor. A national army and navy were restored. To put it briefly, a great deal, if by no means everything, of that which the movement of 1848 had initiated was now reintroduced.

Well may people all over Germany therefore ask: Would there be a Reichstag, an Emperor William II, or even that navy to which he rightly attributes such great importance, without the "disobedience to kings" in 1848? And well may we ask, in view of all the facts above given: Are not the present Kaiser's recent utterances all shown by the clearest facts of history to be grave misconceptions?

KARL BLIND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RELIGION OF A COLLEGE STUDENT.

We have heard many appeals to the college student concerning his duty to the Christian church. He should be, it is urged, a more constant attendant at its worship; he should commit himself more openly to its cause; he should guard himself against the infidelity and indecision which attack him with such strategy under the conditions of college life. May it not be of advantage, however, to consider this relation from the opposite point of view? May it not be instructive to inquire what the Christian church must provide in order to meet the needs of an educated young man, and what the college student demands that the church shall teach and illustrate? What has a young man the right to demand as a condition of his loyalty and devotion? What is there which the Christian church must learn concerning the character and ideals of a normal, educated, modern youth before it can hope to lead the heart of such a youth to an unconstrained obedience? What is the religion of a college student?

There are, of course, certain limitations to such an inquiry. We must assume on both sides open-mindedness, teachableness, seriousness, and good faith. We cannot take into account either a foolish student or a foolish church. There are, on the one hand, some youths of the college age whom no conceivable adaptation of religious teaching can hope to reach. They are self-absorbed, self-conscious, self-satisfied, self-conceited. There is little that the church can do for them, but to pray that, as they grow older, they may grow more humble, and, therefore, more teachable. On the other hand, there are some methods of religious activity which cannot reasonably anticipate the coöperation of educated men. Here and there an imaginative young person may be won by emotional appeals or ecclesiastical picturesqueness; but the normal type of thoughtful youth demands of the church soberness, intellectual satisfaction, and verifiable claims. We must dismiss from consideration both the unreasoning youth and the unreasonable church. We set before ourselves, on the one hand, an alert, open-minded, well-trained youth, looking out with eager eyes into the mystery of the universe; and, on the other hand,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a thoughtful, candid, sensible church, resting its claim not on tradition or passion, but on its perception and maintenance of verifiable truth. How shall these two factors of modern life — the chief factors of its future stability — the life of thoughtful youth and the truth of the Christian religion, come to know and help each other; and what are the traits of Christian teaching which must be unmistakably recognized before it can commend itself to the young student of the modern world?

To these questions it must be answered, that the religion of a college student is marked, first of all, by a passion for reality. No effort of the church is more mistaken than the attempt to win the loyalty of intelligent young people by multiplying the accessories or incidentals of the religious life — its ecclesiastical forms, its emotional ecstasies, its elaborateness of organization, its opportunities of sociability. The modern college student, while in many respects very immature, is extraordinarily alert in his discernment of anything which seems to him of the nature of indirectness or unreality. He has a passion for reality. The first demand he makes of his companions or his teachers is the demand for sincerity, straightforwardness, and simplicity. He is not likely to be won to the Christian life by any external persuasion, laboriously planned "to draw in young people," and to make religion seem companionable and pleasant. These incidental activities of the church have their unquestionable usefulness as expressions of Christian sentiment and service, but they are misapplied when converted into decoys. They are corollaries of religious experience, not preliminaries of it; they are what one wants to do when he is a Christian, but not what makes a thoughtful man believe in Christ. The modern young man sees these things just as they are. Indeed, he is inclined to be on his guard against their strategy. He will nibble at the bait, but he will not take the hook. He will consume the refreshments of the church, he will serve on its committees, he will enjoy its æsthetic effects, but he still withholds himself from the personal consecration which these were designed to induce. He will accept no substitute for reality. He wants the best. He is not old enough to be diffident or circuitous in his desires; he does not linger in the outer courts of truth; he marches straight into the Holy of Holies, and lifts the veil from the central mystery. Thus the church often fails of its mission to the student, because it imagines him to be frivolous and indifferent, when in reality he is tremendously in earnest and passionately sincere.

And suppose, on the other hand, that the church meets this candid creature just where he is, and, instead of offering him accessories and inci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dentals as adapted to his frivolous mind, presents to him, with unadorned and sober reasonableness, the realities of religion. What discovery is the church then likely to make? It may discover, to its own surprise, and often to the surprise of the youth himself, an unanticipated susceptibility in him to religious reality, and a singular freshness and vitality of religious experience. A great many people imagine that the years from seventeen to twenty-two are not likely to be years of natural piety. The world, it is urged, is just making its appeal to the flesh and to the mind with overmastering power, while the experience of life has not yet created for itself a stable religion. Fifteen years ago it was determined in Harvard University that religion should be no longer regarded as a part of academic discipline but should be offered to youth as a privilege and an opportunity. It was then argued by at least one learned person that the system was sure to fail because, by the very conditions of their growth, young men were unsusceptible to religion. They had outgrown, he urged, the religion of their childhood, and had not yet grown into the religion of their maturity; so that a plan which rested on faith in the inherent religiousness of young men was doomed to disappointment. If, however, the voluntary system of religion applied to university life has proved anything in these fifteen years, it has proved the essentially religious nature of the normal, educated young man of America. To offer religion not as an obligation of college life, but as its supreme privilege, was an act of faith in young men. It assumed that when religion was honestly and intelligently presented to the mind of youth it would receive a reverent and responsive recognition.

The issue of this undertaking has serious lessons for the Christian church. It disposes altogether of the meagre expectation with which the life of youth is frequently regarded. I have heard a preacher, addressing a college audience, announce that just as childhood was so assailed by infantile diseases and mishaps that it was surprising to see any child grow up, so youth was assailed by so many sins that it was surprising to see any young man grow up unstained. There is no rational basis for this enervating scepticism. The fact is that it is natural for a young man to be good, just as it is natural for a child to grow up. A much wiser word was spoken by one of my colleagues, who, having been asked to address an audience on the temptations of the college life, said that he should devote himself chiefly to its temptations to excellence. A college boy, that is to say, is not, as many suppose, a peculiarly misguided and essentially light-minded person. He is, on the contrary, set in conditions which tempt to excellence and is peculiarly responsive to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every sincere appeal to his higher life. Behind the mask of light-mindedness or self-assertion which he assumes, his interior life is wrestling with fundamental problems, as Jacob wrestled with the angel and would not let it go until it blessed him. "Your young men," said the prophet, with deep insight into the nature of youth, "shall see visions." They are our natural idealists. The shades of the prison-house of common life have not yet closed about their sense of the romantic, the heroic, the noble.

To this susceptibility of youth the church, if it is wise, must address its teaching. It must believe in a young man, even when he does not believe in himself. It must attempt no adaptation of truth to immaturity or indifference. It must assume that a young man, even though he disguises the fact by every subterfuge of modesty or mock defiance, is a creature of spiritual vision, and that his secret desire is to have that vision interpreted and prolonged. When Jesus met the young men whom he wanted for his disciples, his first relation with them was one of absolute, and apparently unjustified, confidence. He believed in them and in their spiritual responsiveness. He disclosed to them the secrets of their own hearts. He dismissed accessories and revealed realities. He did not cheapen religion or make small demands. He bade these men leave all and follow him. He took for granted that their nature called for the religion he had to offer, and he gave it to them without qualification or fear. The young men, for whom the accidental aspects of religion were thus stripped away and its heart laid bare, leaped to meet this revelation of reality. "We have found the Messiah," they told each other. They had been believed in even before they believed in themselves, and that which the new sense of reality disclosed to them as real, they at last in reality became.

Such is the first aspect of the religion of the student—its demand for reality. To reach the heart of an educated young man the message of the church must be unequivocal, uncomplicated, genuine, masculine, direct, real. This, however, is but a part of a second quality in the religion of educated youth. The teaching of the church to which such a mind will listen must be, still further, consistent with truth as discerned elsewhere. It must involve no partition of life between thinking and believing. It must be, that is to say, a rational religion. The religion of a college student is one expression of his rational life. To say this is not to say that religion must be stripped of its mystery or reduced to the level of a natural science in order to commend itself to educated youth. On the contrary, the tendencies of the higher education lead in precisely the opposite direction. They lead to the conviction that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all truth, whether approached by the way of science, philosophy, art, or religion, opens before a serious student into a world of mystery, a sense of the unattained, a spacious region of idealism, where one enters with reverence and awe. Instead of demanding that religion shall be reduced to the level of other knowledge, it will appear to such a student more reasonable to demand that all forms of knowledge shall be lifted into the realm of faith, mystery, and idealism. It is, however, quite another matter to discover in the teaching of religion any fundamental inconsistency with the spirit of research and the method of proof which the student elsewhere candidly accepts; and we may be sure that it is this sense of inconsistency which is the chief source of any reaction from religious influence now to be observed among educated young men.

Under the voluntary system of religion at Harvard University we have established a meeting-place, known as "The Preacher's Room," where the minister conducting morning prayers spends some hours each day in free and unconstrained intimacy with such students as may seek him. This room has witnessed many frank confessions of religious difficulty and denial, and as each member of our staff of preachers recalls his experiences at the university he testifies that the most fruitful hours of his service have been those of confidential conference in the privacy of The Preacher's Room. But if one were further called to describe those instances of religious bewilderment and helplessness which have seemed to him in his official duty most pathetic and most superfluous, he would not hesitate to admit that they were the by no means infrequent cases of young men who have been brought up in a conception of religion which becomes untenable under the conditions of university life. A restricted denominationalism, a backward-looking ecclesiasticism, an ignorant defiance of biblical criticism, and, no less emphatically, an intolerant and supercilious liberalism — these habits of mind become simply impossible when a young man finds himself thrown into a world of wide learning, religious liberty, and intellectual hospitality. Then ensues, for many a young mind, a pathetic and even tragic period of spiritual hesitation and reconstruction. The young man wanders through dry places, seeking rest and finding none; and it is quite impossible for his mind to say: "I will return unto my house from whence I came out." Meantime his loving parents and his anxious pastor observe with trembling his defection from the old ways, deplore the influence of the university upon religious faith, and pray for a restoration of belief which is as contrary to nature as the restoration of the oak to the acorn from which it grew.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, in all this touching experience, where is the gravest blame to be laid? It must, no doubt, be confessed that among the conditions of college life there are some which tend to encourage in a young man a certain pertness and priggishness of mind which make the old ways of faith seem old-fashioned and primitive. Indeed, it seems to some young men that any way of faith is superfluous to a thorough man of the world, such as the average sophomore ought to be. But these cheerful young persons, for whom the past has no lessons and the future no visions, and for whom the new ideal of self-culture has for the moment suppressed the earlier ideals of self-sacrifice or service, are not a type of student life which need be taken seriously. They are the lookers-on of the academic world, the dilettante and amateur minds in a community of scholars. The strenuous game of real learning goes on; and these patrons of the strife sit, as it were, along the side lines and wear the college colors, but do not participate in the training or the conflict or the victory. We are thinking of that much more significant body of youth who are in deadly earnest with their thought, and who find it an essential of their intellectual peace to attain some sense of unity in their conception of the world. For this type of college youth — the most conscientious, most thoughtful, most precious — the blame for inconsistency between the new learning and the inherited faith lies, for the most part, not with the college, but with the church. There was once a time when these young minds could be secluded by solicitous parents and anxious pastors from most of the signs of change in modern thought. They could be prohibited from approaching great tracts of literature; they could be hidden in the cloistered life of a strictly guarded college; their learning could be ensured to be in safe conformity with a predetermined creed. There is now no corner of the intellectual world where this seclusion is possible. Out of the most unexpected sources — a novel, a poem, a newspaper — issues the contagion of modern thought; and, in an instant, the life that has been shut in and has seemed secure is hopelessly affected.

And how does the young man, touched with the modern spirit, come to regard the faith which he is thus forced to reject? Sometimes he regards it with a sense of pathos, as an early love soon lost; sometimes with a deep indignation, as the source of scepticism and denial. For one educated youth who is alienated from religion by the persuasions of science, philosophy, or art, ten, we may be sure, are thus affected by the irrational or impracticable teaching of religion. It is not an inherent issue between learning and faith which forces them out of the church in which they were born; it is an unscientific and reactionary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory of faith. It is not the college which must renew its conformity to the church; it is the church which must open its eyes to the marvellous expansion of intellectual horizon which lies before the mind of every college student to-day.

There is another aspect of the same experience. This process of intellectual growth is often accompanied, not by a reaction from religion, but by a new appreciation of its reasonableness. In a degree which few who represent the church have as yet realized, the expansion of the sphere of truth is at the same time an enlargement and enrichment of religious confidence. There is going on, within the college, often without the knowledge of the church, a restoration of religious faith through the influence of intellectual liberty. I have seen more than one student come to college in a mood of complete antagonism to his earlier faith, and then I have seen that same youth in four years graduate from college, and with a passionate consecration give himself to the calling of the Christian ministry which he had so lately thought superfluous and outgrown. It was the simple consequence of his discovery that the religious life is not in conflict with the interests and aims of a university, but is precisely that ideal of conduct and service toward which the spirit of a university logically leads. "I beseech you, brethren," says the Apostle who knew most about the relation of philosophy to faith, "that ye present . . . a reasonable service." It is a charge which the Christian church still needs to hear. The service of the church which is to meet the religion of a college student must be a reasonable service, consistent with all reverent truth-seeking, open to the light, hospitable to progress, rational, teachable, free. The church which sets itself against the currents of reasonable thought, and has for great words like Evolution, Higher Criticism, Morality, Beauty, Law, only an undiscerning sneer, is in reality not the defender of the faith, but a positive contributor to the infidelity of the present age. The church which asks no loyalty that is not rational, no service of the heart that is not an offering of the mind, comes with its refreshing message to many a bewildered young mind, and is met by a renewed dedication to a reasonable service.

So far, however, I have described the religion of a college student as it appears in every thoughtful age. There remains one aspect of the religious life which is peculiarly characteristic of a college student in our own generation, and of which the church in its relation to the young must take fresh account. Protestant teaching, from the time of Luther, has laid special emphasis on the Pauline distinction between faith and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

works. It is not a man's performance, either of moral obligations or ritual observances, that justifies him in the sight of God. He must offer that total consecration of the heart, that conversion of the nature, which makes him find his life in God. This teaching was a necessary protest against the externalism and ecclesiastical practices which had been for centuries regarded by many as of the essence of the religious life. "We are justified by faith;" "the just shall live by faith" — these great words give to religion a profounder, more spiritual, and more personal significance as a relation between the individual soul and the living God.

But suppose that this touch of the life of God is felt by the soul of man, and that the soul desires to express its religious life — what is to be its channel of utterance? The history of Protestantism for the most part answers: "The organ of religious expression is the tongue. When the life is moved by the Holy Ghost, it is led to speak as the spirit gives it utterance. It tells rejoicingly of its new birth; it confesses Christ before its fellows; it preaches to others the message which has brought it hope and peace." Here is the basis of a large part of the organization of the Protestant churches — their meetings for free expression of prayer; their association for religious utterance; their test of faith through spoken confession. It is obvious that this channel of expression is legitimate and often inevitable. The fulness of religious emotion which descends from God to man leaps out of many lives into forms of speech, as naturally as the water which descends from the high hills leaps out from its conduit into the air.

What the present age, however, is teaching us, as the world was never taught before, is that another and equally legitimate channel of expression is open to the life of faith. It is the language of works. We have come in these days to a time devoted in an unprecedented degree to the spirit of philanthropy. It is the age of social service. No life can yield itself to the current of the time without being swept into its movement of passionate fraternity and social justice. But what is the attitude of the Christian church to this modern phenomenon of social service? It is quite true that the church is one of the most active agents of this philanthropic renaissance. The sense of social responsibility is manifested by the prodigious increase of parish charities, parish organizations, institutional churches, and general benevolence. The church, however, has failed adequately to recognize the legitimate place of action as a trustworthy witness of faith. To do for others has seemed to the tradition of the church a superadded and secondary effect of religion, not one of its essential and original factors. First, one is to be religious; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then, as a consequence or ornament of his religion, he is to concern himself with the better ordering of the human world.

A much deeper relation between faith and works is indicated by those solemn words in which Jesus sums up, as he says, "the whole law and the prophets." There is, he teaches, a kinship of nature between the love of God and the love of man. The second commandment is like the first. Both are parts of a complete religion. When a modern life, that is to say, is moved by the spirit of philanthropy, that impulse is not something which the church may stand apart from and commend as of another sphere. It is, in fact, one legitimate expression of the religious life; uttering itself not by the tongue, but by the hand, as though there had been heard the great word of the Apostle: "If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" In other words, the church has permitted this modern movement of philanthropy to proceed as though it were not an essential part of the Christian life, when in reality this whole vast enterprise is the way in which the modern world is actually uttering that faith in the possible redemption of mankind, to accomplish which the church of Jesus Christ was expressly designed and inspired. I stood one day in the house of a women's settlement, set in the most squalid conditions of the life of a city and purifying the neighborhood with its unassuming devotion, and a minister of the Christian church who was present looked about him and said: "This is a very beautiful and noble work, but I wish there were more of Christ in it." How could there, one felt like asking, be more of Christ than was already there? Would technical confession or oral expression add any significance to such a work in his eyes who said: "Not every one that sayeth to me, Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of my Father"? Was there ever, indeed, a work more full of Christ? Might not Jesus, if he should come again on earth, pass without notice many a splendid structure reared in his name, and, seeking out these servants of the broken-hearted and the bruised of the world, say to them: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of these least, ye have done it unto me"? Why is the church not far-sighted enough to claim for herself what is justly her own? She clings to the test of faith by a single form of expression, when in fact the spirit of God is manifesting itself at the present time by another way of expression. And so it comes to pass that the most immediate problem for the church is to find a place within her religious experience for the new manifestation of self-effacing philanthropy, and to claim the age of social service as at heart an age of faith.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, at precisely this point, where the first expression of the spirit of God takes the form of the service of man, the Christian church meets the religion of the college student. The normal type of a serious-minded young man at the present time does not talk much about religion. Sometimes this reserve proceeds from self-consciousness and ought to be overcome, but quite as often it proceeds from modesty and ought to be reverenced. At any rate, such is the college student — a person disinclined to much profession of piety, and not easy to shape into the earlier type of expressed discipleship. Yet, at the same time, this young man is extraordinarily responsive to the new call for human service. I suppose that never in the history of education were so many young men and young women in our colleges profoundly stirred by a sense of social responsibility and a passion for social justice. The first serious question which the college student asks is not, "Can I be saved? Do I believe?" but, "What can I do for others? What can I do for those less fortunate than I?" No one can live in a community of these young lives without perceiving a quality of self-sacrificing altruism so beautiful and so eager that it is akin to the emotions which in other days brought in a revival of religion.

What is the duty of the church to a mood like this? The duty of the church — or rather the privilege of the church — is to recognize that this is a revival of religion; that in this generous movement of human sympathy there is a legitimate and acceptable witness of the life of God in the soul of the modern world. It may not be that form of evidence which other times have regarded as valid; it may, perhaps, not be the most direct way of religious expression; but none the less it happens to be the way through which the Holy Spirit is at the present time directing the emotional life of youth to natural utterance. "I am not very religious," said one frank youth to me one day, "but I should like to do a little to make of Harvard College something more than a winter watering-place." But was not that youth religious? Was it not the Spirit of God which was stirring his young heart? What, indeed, is the final object of religion if it is not to include the making of that better world which he in his dream desired to see? In this quality of the religion of a college student the church must believe. It must take him as he is, and let him testify by conduct if he will not testify by words. If the student might be assured that the religion which the church represents is a practical, working, ministering faith; if he could see that the mission of the church was not the saving of a few fortunate souls from a wrecked and drifting world, but the bringing of the world itself, like a still sea-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worthy vessel, with its whole cargo of hopes and fears, safe to its port; if he could believe that in the summons of the time to unselfish service he was in reality hearing the call of the Living God; then he would see in the church not, as he is often inclined to see, an obstinate defender of impossible opinions, or a hothouse for exotic piety, or a cold storage warehouse to preserve traditions which would perish in the open air, but the natural expression of organized righteousness, the body of those who are sanctified for others' sakes, and to such a church he would offer his honest and practical loyalty.

These are the tests to which the church must submit if it would meet the religion of a college student — the tests of reality, reasonableness, and practical service. A religion without reality — formal, external, technical, obscurantist; a religion without reasonableness — omniscient, dogmatic, timid; a religion which does not greet the spirit of practical service as the spirit of Christ — a religion of such a kind may win the loyalty of emotional or theological or ecclesiastical minds, but it is not acceptable to the normal type of educated American youth. Such natures demand first a genuine, then a rational, and then a practical, religion, and they are held to the Christian church by no bond of sentiment or tradition which will prevent their seeking a more religious life elsewhere. And what is this but a wholesome challenge to the church of Christ to renew its vitality at the sources of its real power? The intellectual issues of the present time are too real to be met by artificiality and too rational to be interpreted by traditionalism; the practical philanthropy of the present time is too absorbing and persuasive to be subordinated or ignored. It is a time for the church to dismiss all affectations and all assumptions of authority, and to give itself to the reality of rational religion and to the practical redemption of an unsanctified world. This return to simplicity and service will be at the same time a recognition of the religion of a college student and a renewal of the religion of Jesus Christ.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOUSEKEEPER'S STONE.

THE science of to-day has but a cynical smile for the deluded alchemist who published "The Key of Wisdom" and "A Secret Book on the Philosopher's Stone;" yet for nearly eight centuries the world has profited incalculably by his invention of soap. Baffled in the attempt to transmute the baser metals into gold, he discovered something infinitely better — a boon to the race.

Doubtless, he who modestly claims to have discovered the Housekeeper's Stone will be classed with the lamented author of the mystical books alluded to; yet, in full confidence of the result, the writer recommends an intelligent, patient trial of his recipe in the solution of some of the vexed problems of domestic economy. Let him premise, however, that he is not a quack, and does not proffer a cure-all for the ills of the kitchen. The wisest of physicians defers humbly to Dame Nature, and in his confidential moments avows that he simply touches a button and she does the rest.

The remedy proposed for the embarrassments ensuing from reliance upon domestic service is as old as the hills. It would not warrant copyrighting, and yet it may startle not a few readers. It embraces as its most vital feature the elimination of the title "servant" from our designation of household workers. No just reason can be given for its exclusive use in this connection. In truth, we are all servants of each other — or ought so to be; but the word wears an offensive and obnoxious aspect when restricted to the description of those valuable factors of the human family who minister to us in our most sacred shrine, the home. If any distinction is to be made among workers, let the highest rank attach to this particular class, since our most precious interests are interwoven with the faithful performance of its duties.

The artisan who saws and planes boards, and drives into them the connecting nail, is a "carpenter;" the man who beautifies woodwork, a "painter;" the grimy but intelligent person who controls mechanism in the production of indispensables, a "machinist;" while among our literary treasures is Longfellow's tribute to yet another honored trade:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The smith, a mighty man is he,
With large and sinewy hands;
And the muscles of his brawny arms
Are strong as iron bands."

The lady who displays to us a shawl, a roll of muslin, a book, or what not, at a store counter, is entitled a "saleslady;" her sister, who ingeniously contrives headgear for women, a "milliner;" her cousin, who fashions fabrics of silk, or cotton, into neatly-fitting garments, a "dressmaker;" but the lady who invests our dwelling-place—"home, sweet home"—with an air of neatness and comfort, turns a piece of steak to a nicety, bakes for us the wholesome, delicious bread of our grandmothers, and, above all else, cares for our children, is, perforce, a "servant!" True, in some instances household helpers are classed as "cooks," "chambermaids," "nursery-maids," and "ladies' maids;" but, unfortunately, all of these cognomens are grouped under the generic term of "servants." Why?

Whittier's "Maud Muller" is an universal favorite, and the reading world daintily echoes the Judge's opinion:

"A form more fair, a face more sweet,
Ne'er hath it been my lot to meet.

And her modest answer and graceful air
Show her wise and good as she is fair."

But when Miss Muller enters the kitchen the world is disillusioned. The poem tells of the Judge:

"But he thought of his sisters proud and cold,
And his mother vain of her rank and gold.

So, closing his heart, the Judge rode on,
And Maud was left in the field alone."

And in certain social quarters, the moment a girl crosses the threshold of a house as "hired help," she acknowledges therein inferior rank. Shame upon such philosophy! In a word, it is the upas tree of caste, whose deadly shade is steadily creeping over our family life; for the baleful distinctions of rank are unquestionably multiplying and growing more emphatic.

In the parable of Dives and Lazarus we have an impressive delineation of the fixedness of separation which may exist between two individuals. The gulf existed in the terrestrial life, but might then have been bridged by Dives: in the life celestial not even Lazarus, transposed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as he was in respect of preferable location, might traverse the shadowy abyss. In these days the gulf between Dives and Lazarus is widening; and until the former sends the latter something more than the crumbs that fall from his table, and bridges the gulf by those ministries in general which that immortal man of the common people, Abraham Lincoln, termed "the better angels of our nature," the hiatus will remain.

This is not a dissertation upon socialism. The writer has an equal horror of the man, who, occupying a position in which he can use hundreds of his brethren for his own aggrandizement, forgets their monumental share in his achievements, and the thriftless, cunning fellow, who, after securing an equitable division of the world's wealth, and immediately squandering his portion, insists upon a fresh division. But into the sky of our vaunted democracy has come a cloud rather larger than a man's hand. The social customs of monarchical countries have been freely imported; and the republican eye is frequently offended with a flunkeyism analogous to that which prevails abroad, and too often a labored copy of it.

It is humiliating to observe men dressed in conspicuous livery sitting at the front or rear of private carriages under such marvellous restraint of rule that not by the faintest nod may they recognize the existence of their own mothers if they chance to meet them. It causes one to blush for our humanity to reflect on such an incident as the following: A lady who was being temporarily served in a rural retreat, among old-fashioned farmers, by a young schoolmistress, who took her sick sister's place as a mere matter of accommodation to her employer, requested the obliging teacher to wear her hair plainer and cover it with a cap, lest she be mistaken for a member of the family. The refined girl was wearing a dress as modest as that of a Quakeress; but the obvious purpose of the employer was to make clear the deadly distinction in rank.

It is true that caste prevails in every direction; but in no other sphere is it so keenly realized as in domestic service. The world is wide, and many plebeians may play Diogenes with the patricians without danger; but the wholesome spirit of independence cannot easily be indulged in such close contact with the patrician's family.

There are conditions that cannot be simulated, and relationships that cannot be made harmonious at the fiat of a theorist. It is improbable that the Judge would have done wisely to marry Maud Muller. Though he was not contented when

> "He wedded a wife of richest dower,
> Who lived for fashion, as he for power;"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet he was doubtless more philosophically situated than if he had obeyed the sudden impulse of his equestrian hour. Notwithstanding the inference conveyed by the poem, that, since the learned man sighed when he thought of "the simple beauty and rustic health" of the meadow maiden, he would have been better off with her as his life's companion, other conditions hinted at indicate that bliss would scarcely have attended the union.

The only concession sought is the elimination of caste from the environment of household service. But this will open the way for a remarkable transformation. Let the profession of housekeeping be put upon the same plane as that of the bookkeeper, telegrapher, typewriter, saleslady, etc., and observe the consequence. It may be that many women who seek mercantile positions are disinclined to the so-called drudgery of housework. If this be true, the necessity of making such work attractive to women in general is all the more apparent, for it goes without saying that every woman should know how to keep house, whatever her profession and whatever her rank. If Maud Muller knew how to cook plain food well, and keep a house tidy, the Judge may be forgiven for his indulgence in day dreams, when he

> ". . . closed his eyes on his garnished rooms
> To dream of meadows and clover-blooms."

And the concession would probably bring from their country homes many a prize, in the shape of a girl desirous of becoming acquainted with city life, who would prove eminently satisfactory in performing the work of the house, but who would under no circumstances submit to be entitled a "servant;" for there are many Maud Mullers, sweet and sunny in disposition, kindly and good, and reared in homes of the best moral and religious type, who might be secured as assistants in the home, if they could be sure of being measured by the Golden Rule.

But some bewildered reader will exclaim — as a vision of untidiness, not to say absolute slatternliness, rises to her view, or as she imagines with painful vividness that she is breathing the smoky, choking atmosphere of the kitchen after the ruin of a choice bit of broiling meat — "Surely, there are no such girls to be had!" I calmly reply that they are not at all idealistic, but exist corporeally, doing their work intelligently and cheerfully, and conferring blessings upon the families in which they are employed. There are others awaiting engagements, but we would not recommend them to households in which the social ban prevails. "Servants" they will not be, nor can we criticise them therefor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the rural districts to which I have alluded a very simple social order prevails. Fine character, attractions of mind and person, an affectionate and uncynical nature — these count for as much in the community in connection with household assistants as they do in the case of the employer. The mistress consults the maid and the maid the mistress, even about personal affairs. As a matter of course, they sit at the same table; ride to church in the same carriage; sit in the same pew; and, as a matter of fact, rank precisely the same. Blissful simplicity! How fortunate society would be if to all the refinement and elegance of the age were universally added the spirit indicated by the lines,

> "When Adam dolve, and Eve span,
> Who was then the gentleman?"

Some of the best wives to be found in such sections were once assistants in the homes of their husbands' parents, and were trained by their prospective mothers-in-law. Their excellences were perceived by the eldest sons, and happy matrimony followed. Everybody who has ever visited these parts of the country knows the accomplishments in baking, cooking, and general housekeeping characteristic of their people.

But to look cityward. It is a misfortune that so much of the work in our manufactories falls to the lot of feminine operatives. Home is fundamentally the realm for women; yet, chiefly for the reason set forth in this paper, the clatter and whirr of machinery and the weary monotony of work in a public place are preferred by girls to the secluded quiet of home. Many estimable young ladies are thus engaged who do good service in Sunday-schools and young people's societies. With their intelligence, and natural and cultivable tastes, the training of the household would speedily make them acquisitions.

The atmosphere of our great stores is far from healthful. The breaths of so vast a force of attendants, mingled with those of an army of shoppers, must be very deleterious to all concerned. And yet young women unquestionably prefer such conditions to the delightful environment of a home able to provide the best to be had in all markets. Some of these toilers are perpetually pinched in income, though compelled to dress well; while their slender salaries permit of but cheap lodging and food, unless a father or a brother may be depended upon to furnish a home. Undoubtedly, many of them are disinclined to housework; yet we may safely assume that good food and a good salary, together with such perquisites as the good books and periodicals to be found in certain homes, would tempt many away from mercantile and other public careers, if housework were put upon its proper basis.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Illustration is better than precept. One of the most touching incidents that ever came to the attention of the writer occurred while he was being entertained at the house of a friend. The head of the family was a devout and active church officer. It was his custom to read, each morning, in the presence of the family, a selection from the Bible, and then to offer prayer. When the hour for this exercise approached, the guest was invited into the library, where he noticed the presence of the household helpers. Rising from his chair, the gentleman of the house presented his guest to the assistants, with the simple remark that these were two members of the family whom he had not yet seen. It was a beautiful, brotherly act, and the demeanor of the helpers was a model one. This occurred in a city home.

As a matter of course, in the majority of cases there would be much to learn upon the part of the candidate, and much occasion for patient continuance in well-doing upon the part of the mistress, if the latter were able to impart instruction in housekeeping. In the Housekeeper's Progress — as in that of the Pilgrim — there is many a Hill Difficulty, and many a corresponding Valley of Humiliation. The Plain of Ease is far from spacious, and Doubting Castle lies ever close to Bypath Meadow; but beyond them is the fair and enchanting Land of Beulah, whose blooming gardens and fruitful orchards supply an ample recompense for a dusty and toilsome pilgrimage. However, the ignorant, presumptuous, impudent, brazen persons who sometimes fill household positions, and whose reform can scarcely be hoped for, would soon disappear when unobtrusive, loyal, intelligent, and affectionate helpers could be counted upon. It would be very unjust not to remark that there are many homes of wealth in which the helpers receive fine consideration, and in which much of the discomfort of "the gulf" is smoothed away by kindness and thoughtfulness. But those homes are few indeed in which some evidence of the stigma of servitude, at least its badge, is not recognized. Remove that, and the new era will have dawned.

The maid is the ward of the mistress, and she must share in the homeliness of home, which is the focus of human society. The mistress cannot conscientiously deal with her as if she were purchasing a pound of tea. She cannot evade a certain responsibility growing out of her position. She should clearly know the locality of the home of her maid, and something about the family and its circumstances; and she should take care to inquire courteously from time to time after its health and happiness. It is not necessary for the mistress to confide private matters to her maid, or, *per contra*, for the maid to disclose her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own proper secrets to her mistress. Strangely enough, mistresses have often made their girls confidants in respects most unwise, and have heaped trouble as the result. Such familiarity is fatal, and must be deplored. Yet a good measure of frank and intimate correspondence may be permissible where a sufficiently long acquaintanceship and mutual esteem suggest and prompt it. Still there are matters which should never be ventured upon.

There is really no little responsibility resting upon the employer. It is hers to train her maid in the best aspects of housekeeping, to advise her in the matter of dress and personal appearance, to watch over her friendships, to train her mind, and to help in the development of her moral character. Justice is to be shown in the arrangement of hours of service, and provision made for a proper amount of recreation. Church privileges are to be borne in mind, also occasional mid-week social privileges. If the housekeeper feels appalled at such a vista of duty, it can only be said that this is but an illustration of the obligations that accompany possession. The little whitewashed log cottage on the hillside has few expenses associated with it; but our responsibilities grow in proportion to our acquisitions. It is a day of advance in many respects. There are cooking and sewing schools, and various other institutions for the promotion of household interests. Let the best of these privileges be utilized to the utmost, and their products be brought as tributes to the home.

There is one word of almost magical influence that needs to be whispered in connection with the theme of housekeeping. It is system! Without it, success is doubtful; with it, failure cannot ensue. There must be system for all work, system in hours, system in promptness, system for occupation and system for recreation, system in the rigorous observance of hours of rest and sleep, and system in the hour of rising. When possible, a girl should have in her own right a bright, well-ventilated room, capable of being made comfortable in winter. Attention to this will react in advantage to the employer. Whatever taste the latter expends upon her maid's apartment is an investment sure to result usuriously to herself.

Surely it need not be remarked that a proper supply of food must be provided. And yet there are traditions in some quarters of meagre provision — a feature of which poor and humble homes are guiltless. On the one hand, lessons in extravagance are to be avoided, and, on the other, a pinching diet inadequate to sustain a hard worker. A spoonful of apple-sauce, a thin slice of unbuttered bread, and a cup of tea may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good diet for an overfed stomach accustomed to all the luxuries of the season, but it will not answer for the sustenance of a busy household assistant.

Where there is but one helper, it becomes imperatively necessary that some share of the work shall rest upon the shoulders of the mistress. It is a regretful feature of very many homes that the wife is overladen with the cares of cooking, baking, sewing, sweeping, and the laundry, together with the nurture of the children. Where it becomes possible to have help, it would certainly be unjust to transfer all these duties to one girl, however willing. The division of household labor will stimulate the maid to her best.

The books, papers, and magazines of the home should, of course, be put within reach of the helpers. The library could be made to renew its vigor, and double its value in this way. The stereoscope, with its variety of instructive and pleasing pictures, would contribute delightfully to their entertainment. A microscope might be brought into requisition; perhaps also a telescope or a spy-glass. When examining any interesting thing, it would be well worth while to cause the helper to share in it also; and in such respects, in the almost numberless instances which come to the surface in the experience of an intelligent family, there will be a host of opportunities of doing good, without which ambition no one can be supremely happy. The books referred to should embrace the best fiction, history, and light science.

The recreation of the summer season of which the family partakes is justly the due of the assistants also. The fascinations of the seashore, where the rolling surf ceaselessly breaks and white sails dot the horizon; the cool haunts in the mountains, from whose summits miles of scenic delights stretch away, tinted with an exquisite blue that finally melts into the azure of heaven; the calm, restful surface of some secluded lake — these are among the educational and soulful benefits that a wealthy person can confer upon his poorer relation. Depend upon it, the results are worth having.

Sympathetic words are to be spoken when painful tidings come from home. The maid may be toiling to support an aged parent or an invalid sister. In such a case, words and deeds should be blended; the grateful relief afforded by loving, judicious expressions being supplemented by the proffer of material help. There is a hurtful gossip that permeates society, which we do well to avoid; but we should not go to the other extreme that disdains to notice the happenings of everyday life among our neighbors. The exhibition of feeling upon the part of the mistress

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not mercenary; nevertheless, it may be abundantly rewarded by devotion and sympathy from the maid. Even among the uncultured helpers are to be found crude Peggottys, whose mother-love for the children impresses them to all time.

The relation of mistress to maid must be, in a word, educative. The ultimate of the training in various departments must be character. The responsibility cannot be evaded without condemnation. It is no light thing at any time to stand at the head of a household. There are helpers who would try the patience of a marble statue, if, indeed, they would not exhaust it. There are mistresses who apparently have no feeling. And yet we are fain to believe that there are very many excellent mistresses and many valuable maids. Some of the former have expressed in deed and word their appreciation of the virtues and faithfulness of their servitors. Many of the latter sing loudly the praises of their kindly mistresses; yet, if we could withdraw the false estimate of rank that has so long interfered with its normal development, and introduce into the realm of household service the infallible principle of the human brotherhood, society would sooner approach the divine climacteric.

What if such fine training should eventuate in attracting the attention of some smart young man of good character and industrious pursuits to a recognition of the worth of the girl just blooming into high usefulness? Let the employer feel that her own service has not been in vain — and rejoice! Let her insist — if her maid be from a far-away home — upon providing a simple, pretty wedding in the home where she has been so faithful. She cannot lose by such sisterhood. It is well to contribute to the enlightenment of distant peoples who know nothing of Christian civilization; but in working by proxy we are deprived of the satisfaction to be found in personal effort at close range. No higher work calls us than just such duties as arise in our own households.

ALDEN W. QUIMBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MANILA CENSORSHIP.

FROM June, 1899, to December, 1900, much occurred in the Philippine Islands which was of prime interest to the people of this country, and which it was their right to know. That they were scantily informed on these matters, and that even such information as reached them was garbled and misleading, must be attributed to the military censorship, which continues to be enforced, and which throughout has been absurd and unreasonable. It constituted the great difficulty with which the correspondents of home papers had to contend while in the islands. The difficulties due to climate, sickness, danger, distance, and transportation were of minor importance. Over our heads was an army officer, backed by martial law, who suppressed facts, who demanded to know our sources of information, who delayed the transmission of news, who frequently could not be found except after a search of hours, and who, as a rule, knew less than any one of us what was going on in the Philippines at large. All cable correspondents worked under this censorship, the conditions of which they were for a long time powerless to combat, and the restrictions of which often rendered their best efforts unavailing.

It should be borne in mind here what martial law means. It is applied on the basis that might is right; it is the law which the armed soldier chooses to impose upon the civilian, and from which there is no appeal. Threats that correspondents would be deported from the islands if their actions did not conform to the views of the military were at one time the rule; and while such threats were generally disregarded, yet the power to deport was vested in the military, and no one could know that it would not be exercised. As we had been sent to Manila at heavy expense to transmit news to the United States, deportation would have but poorly served the interests of those at home who were dependent upon us for information.

The experience of a week, or even of a month, with the censorship gave little understanding of its purposes. It was only by coming in contact with its arbitrary exclusions and alterations day after day and year after year, under one governor general after another, that one finally learned the meaning of this military institution. Americans are told,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

officially, that in war time it is necessary to maintain such restrictions; and, as a rule, this statement is believed. It is easy to imagine circumstances in which it would be desirable, and even necessary, to prevent certain information, current in the camp, from reaching the enemy. And there is no gainsaying the fact that a military censorship, enforced to prevent the transmission of news valuable to the other side, or likely to "aid and comfort the enemy," is justifiable, though nowadays it is generally futile. But during the year and a half of which I write there was never a time when the news which the censor stopped from going to the United States was not known to all the insurgent Filipinos in Manila, who were in communication with those in the field. Apparently, the Manila censorship was never maintained in accordance with the only justification of a censorship, namely, to keep the enemy in ignorance; but to prevent the people of the United States from being informed of what was happening in the islands; its keynotes being partisan politics and military pride.

I have heard the censorship described as legitimate when it prevented the sending out of news of advance movements of American troops which would inform the enemy of our plans; but I never heard of a reputable correspondent in the Philippines who tried to send out such information. Insurgent observers of American military movements were always well posted concerning our projected expeditions, and this without the aid of news cabled from the United States back to Manila. The supposition that the censorship prevented the insurgents in Manila from communicating with their agents in Hong Kong and elsewhere, is notoriously ridiculous. It utterly failed to accomplish this. The simple subterfuge of a code with two sets of meanings, one for the censor and one for the recipient of the message, made all intercourse with Hong Kong easy. I once saw a message from Hong Kong which stated: "Ammunition afloat." The Chinaman who received this smilingly showed by his code book that the message, when interpreted, meant: "Am sending you by next steamer one thousand duck eggs." In view of the filibustering from the Chinese coast, these words, "Ammunition afloat," more probably meant what they said.

Upon different occasions, the officials of the cable company, who possessed an intimate knowledge of much that happened in Manila, would inform the military authorities that their censorship amounted to nothing, and was constantly evaded by representatives of the rebels. But, notwithstanding these facts, a military censorship over the American people was maintained until after the second election of Mr. Mc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kinley. It was removed on November 15, for a few months, only to be re-established later, and it is in force again at the time of writing (April 15). The Manila military authorities never attempted, to the knowledge of the public, to open letters in transit in United States mails; and General MacArthur took to himself much credit for it.

Censors came and censors went. In beginning their work they were uncertain what to let pass, and at first almost every news dispatch was carried to the governor general for his approval. Experience and instruction taught them their duties; and the correspondents themselves soon learned what part of their messages the censors would be likely to exclude or alter. We saw that it was the aim of the censors to prevent the transmission of any news which, directly or indirectly, could be used by the opposition to win votes from the present administration, as well as to stop news which they thought "might alarm the people at home." We also saw that it was their purpose to stop the news of any reverse to American arms, or of the failure of any American military expedition. If it was necessary, for any reason, to allow military news of this kind to pass, it was generally altered to give an impression contrary to the facts. Times without number the censor has dictated a correspondent's dispatch in the terms in which alone he would allow it to go, and this when the facts as set forth by the correspondent were undisputed by the censor himself, who had uninterrupted access to the official reports of the campaign. For example, the use of the word "ambush" was prohibited. This meant that if American troops were ambushed by the enemy, or *vice versa*, we could not relate the occurrence. My continued experience further showed me that any fact or statement of conditions which might reflect upon the doings of the army as a whole, or of any part or member thereof, was distasteful, and could not be sent home if the "interests of the service," from the standpoint of the censor, called for its suppression. The censors considered the army above reproach or criticism.

Political events in the Philippines up to the end of 1900 can be classified, in a general way, under two heads: (1) The doings of our Philippine Civil Commission, which worked with the idea of establishing a general civil government for the Archipelago to supersede eventually the military as the governors of the islands; and (2) the political relations of the army with the Filipino people. In the first case, the army censors never dared to interfere with the news of the Commission's doings, purposes, or ideas. Information of this nature was always passed, although it could be plainly seen that the censor would have liked to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stop any news message which tended to explain to the people at home, directly or indirectly, that the Commission would eventually deprive the army of the civil control of Philippine affairs. No such restraint existed with respect to political news emanating otherwise than directly from the Commission.

News of the army's efforts at political dealings with the Filipinos was stopped if the army had not been successful in its undertakings. Notable among examples of this kind was the Pedro Paterno incident. In July, 1900, General MacArthur tried to organize a peace movement among the Filipino people through the instrumentality of Pedro Paterno. It was subsequently found that Paterno represented this movement to his people as nothing other than the granting of Filipino independence, as a result of his own efforts with the American authorities. He succeeded in fooling the Americans until the last moment, and the whole thing resulted in a fiasco. The outcome of this scheme reflected upon the judgment of General MacArthur, and he would not permit the facts in the case to be sent out. A similar case was the failure of the native judges of Manila to fulfil their duties honestly. They were notoriously corrupt, and their justice was a parody. The records of the provost marshal's office were filled with proofs of this state of affairs; but these judges had been placed in office, fathered, and vouched for by the military authorities, who declined to take notice of their notorious shortcomings. Even when one of these natives was suspended from office under the charge of being a party to a scheme to defraud, no news of the matter was allowed to go forth.

The military authorities never defined their position with respect to the censorship. They would never even faintly indicate what news might, or might not, be transmitted to the United States. They reserved the right to suppress anything they saw fit, without precedent or reason, and without explanation. Such an attitude worked a much greater hardship when applied to the local press than it did to the correspondents of home papers. In former days Spain had maintained an official to whom all proofs of local newspapers could be submitted. This official had regular hours of consultation daily, and would decide at once respecting the acceptability of any article shown to him. The American authorities never established such an office, though they were repeatedly asked to do so; neither would they set forth what might, or might not, be published in the Manila newspapers. They contented themselves with threats of fines, imprisonment, and confiscation of plant, in case any matter not acceptable to themselves was printed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They also suppressed innumerable news dispatches addressed from outside points to Manila newspapers. This action was, of course, legitimate when the news thus suppressed endangered the local situation. But they declined to reimburse the local newspapers for the cable tolls paid on these suppressed messages. Even Spain, poor as she was, had never failed to pay the tolls due on messages suppressed by her representatives. There is in existence an International Telegraphic Convention, established to formulate the details of the transmission of telegraphic messages between nations. Article No. 7 of this convention sets forth that the governments agreeing to the terms of this convention may stop the transmission of any message which may appear dangerous to the security of the state. Regulation No. 73 of this same convention says:

"When a telegram is stopped under article No. 7 of the convention, the charge made for transmission is returned to the sender, and the refund is borne by the administration which stopped the telegram."

The International Telegraphic Convention is signed by practically every nation of consequence, the United States excepted. Our own country, as a government, has never had any international telegraphic obligations. The terms of the convention are also accepted by all private companies which do international telegraphic business. Yet the authorities in Manila persistently refused to recognize the claims of senders of suppressed messages for the refund of cable tolls; and communications on the matter were pigeonholed and ignored. Six months ago nearly every paper in Manila had claims against the military authorities, for amounts ranging from $500 to $1,500 (Mexican), arising from sums paid for the transmission of suppressed messages..

It has been interesting to note how both Washington and Manila have disavowed responsibility for the censorship. Washington announced that it was maintained solely because the military commander of the Philippines found it to be a military exigency; while the military commander at Manila declared that he was ready and anxious to abolish it, but was prevented by the fact that Washington insisted upon its maintenance. Upon several occasions Washington promised certain American newspapers, which had correspondents in the Philippines, that the censorship would be mitigated or removed at once; but these were but empty promises. With respect to the attitude of Washington on the Manila censorship, there may be quoted the well-known instance when General Corbin announced in the American press, on October 10, 1899, that this censorship had been removed. This statement was generally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believed by the public, but it was absolutely unfounded. When questioned, on February 21, 1900, respecting this alleged removal, Captain H. A. Greene, of the Twentieth Infantry, then a member of General Otis' staff, and acting as censor, said, in writing:

"Nothing is known in this office concerning American newspaper statement that the press censorship in the Philippines has been removed. The censorship continues under War Department instructions."

The censorship caused daily delay in the transmission of news. The censor had irregular office hours, and did not understand that a civilian might want to send a cable message when the censor did not choose to be available. The military authorities failed to realize that the fact of arbitrarily imposing a restriction on the free use of such an important feature of modern life as telegraphic communication carried with it an obligation to the general public to facilitate the use of the cable under the restrictions enforced. The military governor never appointed more than one officer to act as censor at the same time; and, from the standpoint of the gentleman so appointed, he could hardly be expected to remain on duty at a given place for eighteen or twenty hours a day. I once arrived at a censor's office, with a dispatch to be censored, at one minute after half-past five, the hour at which he went home, only to have him refuse to look at my message until eight o'clock; and then my interview had to take place at his residence, two miles away. Another officer, who was made censor under General MacArthur, announced that his office hours were from ten until twelve in the morning, and from two until four in the afternoon. When asked where he could be found outside of office hours, he replied that he could not tell; that he might be at home, that he might be driving about the city, or that he might be with friends. The censor's restrictions on the use of the cable were not enforced upon press correspondents alone. With the exception of a few exempted firms, any private citizen, business man, or merchant of Manila, if cabling on personal affairs, must have his message looked over. Once, when a censor was indisposed, I saw the commercial cable business of the Philippines, both incoming and outgoing, delayed and stalled for sixty hours, because the authorities had not appointed a substitute to act in his place. Upon this occasion the newspaper correspondents represented that their messages could not be thus delayed, with the result that a temporary censor was appointed to deal with press dispatches only. While the officer above referred to held the position, Manila could receive and send messages for four hours a day only; and even during these limited hours the censor would frequently be absent from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his office. Time and again I reached that gentleman's office, when he should still have been on duty, only to find that he had elected to go driving. Then, in order to get a message through, I had to search the whole town to find him. On Sundays he was often entirely out of reach. He naturally considered Sunday a day of rest and recreation, and was inclined to resent the intrusion of a man with messages. The general impression prevailed among the military that news was just as good if sent some time the next day.

Every message had to be initialled as O.K. before the cable company would accept it for transmission. The censor, as a military officer attached to the staff of the commanding general, was often anxious to be informed concerning the sources from which the information contained in a news message was derived. It was manifestly impossible to divulge to the commanding general the names of those American officers, or Filipinos for that matter, who had supplied the correspondent with his information. If we had made a practice of so doing, we should have gathered very little news. The commanding generals frequently ordered officers not to give news to correspondents; and army officers have been reprimanded for the supposed infringement of this order. I recall a piece of news which emanated from the headquarters of the late General Lawton. This was submitted to the censor, who at once informed General Otis of the contents of the message. The officers attached to the headquarters whence the news in question had emanated were so severely taken to task by the commanding general that for days afterward that source of information was sealed.

The censor was generally well posted on military happenings throughout the islands; but he was apt to be ignorant on matters outside his particular province — on religious, political, and other affairs, for instance. I have had messages suppressed because the censor was not informed concerning what I said. He did not question my statement: he simply knew nothing about it. Or he would hold my dispatch up until he could inquire concerning that particular subject, or until he had a chance to submit it to his superior officer, the commanding general. This practice accounted for many delays. A correspondent would often spend time and money and undergo hardships in obtaining good and exclusive news, only to have it refused. He would then have to wait for permission to file; and by the time this was granted, the story, in all probability, had become common property, had been printed in the local press, and was in the hands of the other press representatives. Several successive experiences like the foregoing discouraged one's efforts to do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good work. I have had messages delayed for forty eight hours, until official communications on the same subject had been forwarded to Washington. Upon one occasion I was thus delayed for three days, and was assured that I could file after the official message had been sent. After waiting until this was done, I was told that I could send nothing at all on the matter in question, which was the capture, by the insurgents, of Marinduque Island and of fifty-one men of Company F, Twenty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, under the command of Captain Shields. The authenticity of my news on this subject was never questioned, although headquarters refused to confirm it, even after official dispatches had been received corroborating the incident.

The time required for the transmission of a message from Manila to New York, after it had passed and had been filed, varied several hours, and could never be known beforehand. According to the cable company, seven hours suffice for such transit; but experience has shown me that it generally takes a news message of a hundred words or more ten or twelve hours to get from Manila to New York. Manila is, roughly speaking, thirteen hours ahead of New York time. In other words, when it is day in Manila, it is the night before in New York. If a dispatch is filed between 5 and 7 p.m. in Manila, it is then between 4 and 6 a.m. of the same day in New York. Add to this New York time ten or twelve hours for the transmission of the message, and you get the hour of arrival here. This brings a 7 o'clock dispatch from Manila to New York at about 5 p.m., or two hours before it is filed. Most of the news in the Philippines, as elsewhere, occurs during the day, and is put on the wires in the evening or at night. More dispatches were, of necessity, put on the wire at Manila between the hours of 5 and midnight than during any other period of the day; consequently, most news dispatches were received by the New York newspapers between the hours of 3 p.m. and midnight. I have risen at 5 or 6 a.m. with news gathered late the night before, and have ridden five miles to the cable office, calculating and hoping to get the matter over in ample time for afternoon editions. I may have succeeded, but it was impossible to tell; it was always hitting in the dark.

A message between Manila and New York undergoes thirteen relays; that is to say, it is taken off and put on the wire again thirteen times. This is often done at the relay points by native operators, whose knowledge of English is confined to dots and dashes. This increases the chances of a message being received in an incomprehensible form, with consequent delay in deciphering it. Press messages relating to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boer war and the trouble in China were considered by the operators to be of greater interest to the general public than Manila news; and at Singapore and Hong Kong news from South Africa and China was often placed ahead of waiting Manila dispatches.

On the cable everything takes precedence over press messages, which are never sent until the station where they are filed is entirely clear of other business. This process is repeated at every station on the line. Government messages have precedence on the wire over all other matter; then come "urgent messages," paid for, from Manila, at the rate of seven dollars a word; then commercial or full rate messages; and lastly press news. Even then press matter costs seventy-seven cents a word from Manila. Urgent messages will come through in from two to three hours; but the price prohibits their use except for the most important bulletins.

The Manila censorship was brought to a temporary close in the following way: On October 11, 1900, I received this cablegram from my office, "Is censorship reasonable now? Answer." This message was handed to me by the censor, with the comment that it was a difficult question for me to reply to. I asked him if he would permit me to send an uncensored reply to this query, citing as a precedent the fact that a predecessor had permitted an uncensored answer to an identical question received during his censorship. He replied that inasmuch as the military authorities did not consider the censorship to be unreasonable, they would not permit me to characterize it as such, and that my answer must be submitted to him. Accordingly, I prepared a careful reply, in which I said that the censorship was unreasonable; that my news was often delayed from twenty-four to forty-eight hours; that I was prohibited from sending in established facts as such; and that the censor altered statements of facts and occurrences. I was sure of every statement contained in this answer, and I could easily substantiate every qualification. I submitted this message to the censor, who at once took it to General MacArthur. The latter sent me word that my dispatch was untrue and misleading, but that, if I persisted, he would permit me to transmit it. I sent the message, adding that while General MacArthur characterized it as untrue and misleading, he still permitted it to go. Forty-eight hours after this message was filed, the censor who took the message to General MacArthur was suddenly removed from his post and transferred to the staff of General Bates.

On Sunday, October 21, the new censor told me that a cable message had been received from my office, but that, owing to its contents,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General MacArthur was undecided whether or not to permit me to see it. Later on the same day this message was given to me. It read: "Secretary Root assures me the censorship will be removed immediately." I waited three days, and then cabled: "Censorship unchanged." In the meantime another censor had been appointed. On November 14, the latter informed me that the Manila censorship would be removed the next day. I asked whether this removal followed instructions from Washington, and was told, with some heat, that it did not matter where the order originated. Then, in easier tones, I was informed that some months previously General MacArthur had recommended the abolition of the Manila censorship, and that this step was now taken in compliance with his suggestion. The next day the censorship on press dispatches between Manila and the United States was, for the time being, abolished. At the same time the cable company at Manila was instructed to hand every evening to the military governor copies of all press dispatches filed that day. The censorship on press or commercial cablegrams between points in the Philippine Islands themselves, and between Manila and points in Europe, was never removed.

A few words may be added with respect to the cable route from Hong Kong, which is three or four days by steamer from Manila. Messages could have been mailed from Manila to Hong Kong and there filed; thus avoiding the Manila censorship. This was often done; but such an evasion of their jurisdiction was offensive to the military authorities; and no one correspondent could afford, in view of the strong competition in news gathering, to offend the ruling powers. Hence Hong Kong was used only when necessary. Mailing to Hong Kong meant a delay of at least three days; and with one's rivals filing news from Manila, under the censor, as best they could, the exclusive use of Hong Kong as a starting-point was impossible.

A censor's ruling was absolute, and an appeal could only be made to the commanding general, who always sustained his subordinate. It was only when the matter of the censorship was vigorously taken up at Washington that Manila realized it could not always act without consideration of the interests and rights of the American press.

The system of censorship described in this article again became operative at Manila, under General MacArthur, in the spring of the present year.

HAROLD MARTIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE BRITISH INDUSTRIAL SITUATION.

AMERICANS with the protective bias have been observing with keen interest the trend of industrial events in Great Britain, because they are convinced that the economic policy adhered to by that country is on trial, and that the result will be sure to discredit many, if not all, of the theories of those who have advocated complete freedom of trade. It is possible, therefore, that one who approaches the subject from the standpoint of opposition to Cobdenism may say something that may be of use in the present discussion of the commercial future of the United Kingdom.

In all the articles on the subject which have come under my observation in British reviews and newspapers, I have noted that the writers apparently fear to attack the problem fairly and squarely. Even "Calchas," who does not hesitate in his remarkable contribution to the January "Fortnightly" to declare that it is only a question of whether Great Britain can maintain second place in the commercial race, and who does not shrink from admitting that free trade does not always work well in practice, insists that "the soundness of the abstract economics" of the Manchester school cannot be disputed. If British writers could be induced to dismiss the idea that the doctrine of free trade is impregnable, it might be possible for them to avoid arguing in a circle. That is what they are now doing. "Calchas" and all who like him are able to stare the situation in the face, and who frankly confess that the Cobden dream of making Great Britain the world's workshop must be dismissed by Britons, in their efforts to suggest remedies to avert what they regard as a great evil, invariably make recommendations which are based on the assumption that the British are naturally better fitted for manufacturing than other people.

This may seem like a baseless charge to those who are familiar with the contents of the article, "Will England Last the Century?" in which the writer above mentioned emphasizes a view recently expressed by Count von Posadowski Wehner, the German Secretary for the Interior,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who declared that it was the tendency of all civilized peoples to aim at self-sufficiency. "Calchas" says:

> "All over the progressive world the textile mills and ironworks of our competitors will be followed by their shipyards and their shipping. They will deal more and more directly with each other instead of through us. We have reached our limit. England can be but one among the workshops, the warehouses, and the transport managers of the earth."

Here is a plain admission of the complete breakdown of the Cobden idea; but "Calchas," owing to the tremendous influence of the prevalent British belief that "the correctness of the abstract economics of free trade cannot be disputed," is unable to recommend any other course of action than the one which has been steadily adhered to by the United Kingdom ever since her inhabitants became convinced that they were better adapted to the pursuit of manufacturing than most, if not all, other peoples.

If the British were as practical as they claim to be they would abandon all attempts to achieve the impossible. But they are not. According to the admissions of many competent observers they are worshippers of a fetich. They allowed themselves to be deluded by the teachings of a school of economists, whose theories have been utterly discredited by events; and they fear to stultify themselves by abandoning a doctrine which they once implicitly believed in, but now have their doubts about. Their writers talk contemptuously about the Chinese peculiarity which demands that "face" be saved; but they go to still greater extremes and refuse to correct an error, even though the correction may accentuate an impression which has universally prevailed until very recently, that no people in ancient or modern times ever made such excellent use of their advantages as those inhabiting the British Isles.

If it is impossible to make Great Britain the world's workshop, it ought to be evident to those Britons who now admit this that the right thing for Britain to do would be to abandon that portion of her trade policy which was especially designed to accomplish the object which has confessedly failed. Free trade proceeded on the theory that the people of countries with large resources in the shape of raw materials and food-stuffs would find it profitable to exchange them for British manufactured goods. It is idle to discuss the question whether the theory was sound. It is no longer a question of theories, but one of conditions. The peoples who were expected to confine themselves to the rôle of producers of food-stuffs and raw materials have refused to accept their place in the cast. They have read their Adam Smith with diligence, and are disinclined to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

engage in a business which he plainly says is unprofitable, that of exchanging a great quantity of the rude products of the soil for a very small quantity of manufactured articles. They are all anxious to play leading parts, and insist upon being manufacturing Hamlets or Richards, so that they may occupy the centre of the economic and political stage.

This fact is too apparent to be disputed. There is not a civilized people on the face of the globe that does not aim at self-sufficiency; and some that we are accustomed to look upon as only semi-civilized feel the stir of this desire. The procession of events marches rapidly in these days. The barbarian of yesterday may be a civilized man to-morrow. Fifty years ago Western nations forced Japan to open her ports to the outside world. A quarter of a century hence the people of the rest of the world may be casting about for means to prevent an industrial invasion of their ports by the Japanese. To-day Europeans and Americans are eager to teach the Chinese their habits, so that they may learn to consume the surplus products of Western workshops. To-morrow we may be studying how to prevent the adaptive Chinese from flooding our markets with manufactured goods. If we could persuade the Chinese, the Japanese, and the other peoples upon whom we desire to unload our surpluses, that the proper thing for them to do would be to confine themselves to producing those commodities which we need, and which do not come into competition with the articles we wish to sell them, all would be well. But, unfortunately, all peoples seem to be tarred with the same economic brush. The love of a good thing is not confined to Western peoples. The profits of manufacturing present as many allurements to the Oriental mind as to the Occidental. Japanese efforts and progress in various modern industries testify to this; and the facility and success with which the Chinese have taken hold of manufacturing in California indicate what will happen when Western ideas and habits are once fairly introduced into China.

The outlook for a considerable expansion of external trade being so unpromising, it would seem that the right thing for Britons to do would be to recognize the situation and to cast about for other methods of utilizing their surplus energies. If the world refuses to permit Great Britain to become its workshop, there is no good reason why Great Britain should not remain her own workshop, or, to put the matter more accurately, why she should not regain an advantage she has temporarily parted with while making the vain effort to establish a permanent commercial supremacy. It is to the accomplishment of this that the best British thought should be directed; and American protectionists are confident

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that this will occur as soon as the statesmen and publicists of the United Kingdom cease to pay deference to a theory and elevate practical considerations to the first place. Cobdenism has converted Englishmen into sentimentalists, and has made them attach more importance to the showings of tables of exports and imports than to essentials. The followers of the Manchester school have so accustomed themselves to regard trade as of more importance than production that they have quite overlooked the possibility that a proper encouragement of the latter may result in expanding the former. Their action suggests the fable of the dog who lost his breakfast in attempting to snatch the reflection in the water of the bone he carried in his mouth.

The inhabitants of the British Isles now number over 41,000,000. They have developed the ability to consume to a higher degree than all other peoples except Americans. Their power to do this, however, depends largely upon their ability to produce, not for export, as some seem to think, but for domestic consumption. In order to continue the present volume of production, it is not necessary that Britons should produce as cheaply as other peoples. They may largely increase the output of their mines and farms, and yet the products of both may be produced at a greater apparent cost than similar things are by the people of other nations. Experience has demonstrated that this is true. It has shown that the Americans were able to increase their production during a long period in which the cost of the things produced exceeded that of other countries. The explanation is simple. It is due to the operation of a law the existence of which the free traders have deliberately ignored, namely, that of the stimulus of self-dependence. When American legislators, by their protective tariffs, virtually made foreign goods of a certain character too dear to be purchased, they said in effect to the people of the United States: If you want these things you must make them for yourselves. As the American people had been educated along lines which made their desires practically unlimited, they at once set to work to satisfy them, with the result testified to by "Calchas" and others, when they cite the fact that the output of steel and iron and other products gives the United States a foremost position in the ranks of producers.

It goes without saying that the consumptive desire is as active in the United Kingdom as in the United States, and that it will continue to exist as long as British legislators will permit it to operate. It can only do so by keeping the great majority of the 41,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom at work productively. If, through the tariff legislation of foreign countries, it becomes more and more difficult and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at length impossible to employ profitably the millions of operatives in British mills and workshops in manufacturing for the outside world, then the people of the United Kingdom must turn to and manufacture for themselves. The condition that will then ensue will not differ very materially from that which constantly arises in the vast territorial area of the United States, where the proprietors of the soil are frequently obliged, and with profit to themselves, to change their mode of cultivation. In many parts of the Eastern States of the American Union it has ceased to be possible to raise the cereals in competition with the West; but, except in rare cases, that has not caused the land to be thrown out of cultivation. On the contrary, it has resulted in a compulsory diversification of the agricultural industry; and highly remunerative fruit and truck farming has taken the place of the less profitable cropping of the commoner grains.

It may be urged that this illustration does not present a real analogy; that the resources of the British Isles will not permit any "pent-up Utica"; that, in short, to put it as baldly as "Calchas" does, if Great Britain cannot keep her external trade, she cannot keep her empire and her population. There is a confusion of ideas, however, in this latter assumption, and it is due to the fact that "Calchas" thinks that the fortunes of the people of the British Isles are wholly dependent upon the maintenance of the empire. It is conceivable that Great Britain could remain a powerful nation if shorn of several million square miles of the territory over which the Union Jack now floats. It is even thinkable that, divested of part of this tremendous area, which is a greater source of expense than of revenue, the United Kingdom might be in a better position not only for defence, but to strike, than she is at present. Not many years ago the Manchester school of economists taught, and the majority of the British people acquiesced in the teaching, that it would be the part of wisdom to help the colonists to prepare themselves thoroughly for self-government, and then permit them to set up for themselves. Although this belief was the result of the conviction that the universal adoption of free trade would render Great Britain commercially impregnable, there was underlying it a knowledge of the fact that the maintenance of a great empire upon the conditions which the British had imposed upon themselves would prove enormously costly and a source of vulnerability.

Before attempting to present the evidence that the expansion of the British empire along the lines now followed is proving a source of weakness rather than of strength, it will be well to set out the American pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tectionist view of the possibility of Great Britain increasing her productivity and wealth, and consequently her real power. This view is based on observation of the fact that the people of the United Kingdom are becoming more and more addicted to the unnecessary habit of depending upon foreigners for things which they might with profit produce for themselves. I do not mean by this that they are importing articles from abroad which, under present conditions, could be produced more cheaply at home. Price lists would promptly expose the folly of such a contention. But I do contend that there are many branches of manufacture and agriculture now wholly or comparatively neglected, which, with proper encouragement, could be made to flourish. The proof is abundant that if such a course were pursued it would make the products really cheaper and more accessible to the British people, although they might nominally appear to be dearer.

An illustration is furnished by the growth of the silk manufacturing industry in the United States. Under the influence of a stiff protective tariff it has developed to great proportions; the value of the product of American silk textile factories now being in excess of that of the entire output of the manufactories of France. The entire American product of silken fabrics is consumed at home; and although the prices may nominally range higher than in free-trade England, it is a significant fact that the working people in the United States are not strangers to the use of silk textiles. The shop girl, the feminine domestic, or the female factory operative in the United States who is not the possessor of one or more garments of silk may be set down as exceptionally thrifty or destitute of the ambition to shine in the eyes of her associates. There are few such in America.

Investigating the history of this industry in the United Kingdom, we find that at one time it was in a most flourishing condition, but that since, under the pressure of foreign competition, it has shrunk to comparatively insignificant proportions. In 1857, according to Mulhall's "Industries and Wealth of Nations," the British consumption of raw silk was 10,750,000 pounds, and the value of silk fabrics produced in the same year is given by the same authority at £21,500,000. Thirty-four years earlier, in 1823, the consumption of raw silk by the factories of the United Kingdom was only 2,470,000 pounds. A great part of the increase of production which these figures imply was during the period before the abrogation of the corn laws. In 1898 the imports of raw silk into Great Britain aggregated 2,138,912 pounds, being 331,088 pounds less than in 1823. The tremendous diminution of production after

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1857 was not due to a declining taste for silk goods; for in 1898 there were imported into the United Kingdom broad stuffs, ribbons, and other manufactures of silk to the amount of $83,116,150. The vast quantity these figures represent and the silk goods domestically produced were almost wholly consumed by the people of the British Isles, as the value of the exports and re-exports of silk manufactures reached the insignificant amount of $12,025,920 only, of which the sum of $4,381,110 belongs in the latter category.

The story of the decline of British silk manufacturing is not the only one that may be told; but it is by far the most forceful, because its details can be contrasted with those of the growth and prosperity of the industry in another country which, like Great Britain, is compelled to import its raw material. The factories of the United States work up raw silk brought under disadvantageous circumstances from far-away lands; but they have been producing the finished fabrics in constantly increasing quantity and notable improvement of quality, until now it is estimated that the output exceeds that of France. It is even difficult to suggest a reason why the British silk industry could not have held its own if it had been similarly encouraged; and, I believe, no American protectionist, with all the arguments in favor of free trade in his mind, can be persuaded that Great Britain would not have vastly benefited by holding fast that which the enterprise and ingenuity of her working people had secured for her. When the British silk industry was exposed to the competition of peoples whose standard of living was much lower than that which prosperity had created for the workingman of the United Kingdom, it held a commanding position which it could easily have maintained. It was needlessly sacrificed to a theory.

Unless the people of Great Britain abandon this theory, they must prepare to see other industries share the fate of that whose history has just been cited. A glance at the table of British imports for the year 1898 discloses that greater or less quantities of the following classes of manufactured articles were bought from foreigners and consumed by the people of the United Kingdom: Books, maps and charts, buttons and studs, candles, caoutchouc, chemicals, china, porcelain and earthenware, clocks, cocoa and chocolate, confectionery, cordage, corks, cotton-yarns, cotton piece goods, etc., embroideries, glass bottles and other glass, hair and goat's wool, hardware and cutlery, ice, jute, lace and articles thereof, leather, boots and shoes, gloves, linen yarns and manufactures of linen, matches, iron, steel and machinery, zinc, musical instruments, paper and manufactures of paper, paraffin, pictures and drawings, sew-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing machines, silk manufactures, fur garments, etc., straw plaiting, sugar (refined) and candy, tobacco, manufactures of tobacco, toys, matches, house framings and cabinet work, woodware and turnery, woollens, yarns, yeast, etc. In 1898 the importations of these articles totalled over £107,000,000. There were also imported food-stuffs of various kinds valued at about £126,000,000. The remainder of the imports during the year may be roughly set down as raw materials. Their stated value was in the neighborhood of £245,000,000, or about £12,000,000 more than the combined values of imports of manufactures and food-stuffs.

I have enumerated the classes of manufactured articles imported into Great Britain, and have referred to the imports of food-stuffs in the same connection, for the purpose of emphasizing as strongly as possible the belief entertained by most protectionists that a very large portion of the imports of this character, aggregating nearly £233,000,000, would, with proper encouragement, be produced by British artisans and agriculturists. They fail to produce them at present not because they are less skilful, or because the resources of the United Kingdom will not permit of their production in that country, but chiefly because the foreigners who export to Great Britain are resorting to methods which permit them to maintain prices at home by dumping their surpluses on the one country which still consents to be made the victim of the practice. Lord Rosebery, in his speech before the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce, delivered on January 16 last, treated this as a comparatively new device, and credited Americans with its origination. He is in error. Many years ago his own countrymen deliberately resorted to the method, and were instigated to that course by Lord Brougham, who, in 1815, publicly urged that it would well be worth the while of British manufacturers and merchants to

"incur loss upon the first exportation, in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle these rising manufactures in the United States which the war has forced into existence contrary to the natural course of things."

It is not necessary, however, to fix the date of the beginning of the practice, or to inquire closely into the motives which have prompted it, or to ask ourselves whether the world would be better off if it were abandoned. So far as this inquiry is concerned, the only thing to determine is whether it is working injuriously to Great Britain, and, if so, whether any remedy can be successfully applied. It appears to be generally admitted that the United Kingdom is a serious sufferer by the system of forcing exports to which foreigners have resorted. Those who are curious regarding the details may find a great deal of information in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

articles contributed by Mr. J. Stephen Jeans to "Engineering," in which he describes the results of what he terms "high organization" in Germany and the United States, and in which he rather lamely concludes that "in so far as Germany or any other country sells in neutral markets at less than cost, it is not fair competition." But Mr. Jeans quite overlooks the fact that there is no such thing as fair competition in trade. There is not a manufacturer in the United Kingdom or any other country who would not undersell his rival at the expense of a present loss if he foresaw a future gain from the process. It is the common custom to dispose of surplus stocks without reference to their cost of production. In the United States this was done for many years in a bungling fashion; but a leaf was taken out of the history of British experience, and American manufacturers now seek to market their surpluses without breaking home prices. They learned the bitter lesson that the surplus when dumped on the domestic market fixes the price, without reference to the cost of the product; and they have governed themselves accordingly. Mr. Jeans says that this dumping of surpluses

"could be effectively met only by the adoption elsewhere of a similar economic system which, however, cannot be looked for in England, wedded as she is to free trade, whatever consequences that system may involve."[1]

If this is true, then all the discussion of the situation which fills the pages of the reviews and the columns of the daily press of Great Britain is wasted; for nothing is more certain than the fact that the British, if they wish to hold their own in the commercial race, must adopt the methods of other manufacturing nations. An earthenware vessel runs great risk of being broken when set afloat on a pond in which brass ones are swimming. From the standpoint of the free trader, the methods of such nations as Germany and the United States may be regarded as offensively brazen; but if brazenness is to prove the winning quality in the commercial race, those who have adopted potsherds must abandon them if they wish to win. Armor of the latter kind will prove too brittle for offensive or defensive purposes in the fierce clash of overproduction which the future is sure to witness as a result of that tendency toward self-sufficiency which is so marked a feature of modern times.

Lord Rosebery, when speaking of the possible effects upon the industries of Great Britain of this forcing-out system, remarked that it was a danger which the country could not afford to disregard. He thus suggested the gravity of the situation by an illustration:

"Suppose a trust of many millions, of a few men combined so as to compete

[1] "Engineering Magazine," December, 1897.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with any trade in this country [Great Britain] by underselling all its products, even at a considerable loss to themselves, and we can see in that what are the possibilities of the commercial outcome of the immediate future."

The illustration was pertinent enough, but it was weakened by assuming that the difficulty was increased by the accumulation of great fortunes in the hands of a few men. The contributions of the many to joint stock enterprises are manipulated as effectively as the capital of successful Carnegies. A great "trust" or industry, the shares of which may be held by thousands, is just as likely to pursue the deprecated course as a combination of "a few men." It is the dumping, not the manner of the act or by whom it is done, that concerns the people of the United Kingdom. It can make no difference to them whether their manufacturers are undersold by a single foreigner who owns a plant worth many millions, or whether the underselling is done by a great foreign plant, the capital for which was furnished by several thousand subscribers. To inveigh against trusts in such a connection is to cross the trail with a red herring: it necessarily results in diverting the pursuer from the track of truth. In like manner, the emphasis laid upon the need of better education, and upon the shortcomings, real or fancied, of British workingmen, has a tendency to disguise the facts, and thus to make it impossible to find an effective remedy.

The malady from which Great Britain is suffering is her open ports, or, perhaps, it would be better to say that these have promoted it. They were thrown open on the assumption that certain healthful results would follow. The expectation has been disappointed. The most important one, namely, that other nations would imitate British example, has not occurred. On the contrary, the opposite course has been pursued. Instead of opening their ports freely to the British, rival peoples have deliberately framed tariffs which have had the effect of making it difficult for the manufacturers of the United Kingdom to market their surplus productions, and, at the same time, have resorted to methods which seem to be effectually displacing British wares in the British Isles. The foreigners may be pursuing uneconomic methods, as the Cobdenites assert, or promoting the best interests of their countries, as protectionists assume; but in either case the fact remains that Great Britain is playing a losing game. Indeed, she is doing the uncommercial thing of persistently giving something for nothing — a line of action which, in the long run, must result in disaster.

I am not disregarding the free-trade argument that the gain to Great Britain comes in the form of cheap things for consumption, nor am I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disposed to ignore the evidence to which Cobdenites point with pride to justify their position. On the contrary, protectionists will cite the tremendous increase of imports into Great Britain as positive proof of the untenableness of the theory that a nation can afford to continue indefinitely a policy the effect of which is to encourage foreign at the expense of domestic production. They point to the fact that the rivals of Great Britain are successfully assailing, one after another, the industries upon which she relies for her prosperity; and they refer to the details of the tables of exports and imports to expose the fallacy of the belief that a people can easily readapt itself to the conditions created by the unrestrained competition of foreigners. If there were any foundation for this latter assumption, the concern which daily finds expression regarding the industrial future of the United Kingdom would be absent; and it would be unnecessary for publicists to rack their minds to find a cause for an admittedly bad state of affairs, or to propose remedies all of which are essentially as protective in character as duties avowedly levied on imports for that purpose.

If the Cobden theory were sound, the British people, whenever they should be driven out of one branch of manufacturing, would have no occasion for uneasiness. All they would have to do would be to turn to others. But it is not. There is a fatal flaw in it. It will not work in practice, because the people of other nations insist upon entering every avenue of industry. There is no disposition to accept the doctrine that one nation is especially fitted to carry on profitably a certain kind of industry, while others pursue different ones because they are adapted to them. All-aroundness, or, as the German Secretary for the Interior puts it, "self-sufficiency" is the order of the day; and it prevents Cobdenism from developing into a universal system.

The result of the refusal of the world to accept free trade is overproduction; but this is not an unmixed evil. It certainly contributes to the end which Cobdenites professed to aim at. There is no doubt that it tends to that real cheapness which is indicated by the enlarged ability to consume. This hardly admits of argument. If, owing to artificial stimulus, the production of iron is increased fourfold during a period in which the consuming population has scarcely doubled, then there is a distinct gain which can be directly traced to the putting forth of energies which would have otherwise lain dormant. Evils may exist concurrently with the greatly increased production; but they cannot be attributed to the system which stimulates production; they must be set down to other causes. If a crowd in its eagerness to get at the contents of an overflowing gran-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ary tramples out a few lives, it will not be charged that the farmers who produced the grain are to blame for exerting themselves to fill the storehouse with the products of their fields and toil. No more can protection be held responsible for the shortcomings of the modern distributive system. Its primary aim is to promote production, and thereby increase the national wealth. If it accomplishes this it justifies itself; and it is illogical either to denounce it, or to ask that the system be abandoned, because modern legislators or economists have not found themselves equal to the task of devising means to absorb the increased production.

It must be obvious that whether the protectionist view is sound or unsound, no argument can be presented which will induce the nations which have adopted the policy to abandon it. That is now impossible. As the years go on, the tendency which Lord Rosebery deprecates will increase rather than diminish. There will be a constant effort to get rid of the surplus productions of a country without sacrificing the producers. The idea is now generally entertained by workingmen in the United States, and it is shared in by those of Germany, that excessive competition in the home market is destructive to domestic industry. The opinion of Mr. Jeans, that the effect of organization is "to make the home business so profitable that manufacturers can afford, if necessary, to lose on export orders," and thereby "build up trade and keep their manufacturing establishments and their workingmen fully employed," is now accepted by a great majority of those who control affairs in the United States and Germany. This being the case, Great Britain must adapt herself to the new conditions, or she will go to the wall. It is idle to talk about fair competition. Under the circumstances there can be none.

Again, if matters cannot be so adjusted that the contest will be one in which skill and aptitude determine the result, it must be a mistake to lay stress on increased education as a remedy. A people cannot be too well educated; but if it were possible for the British by improving their educational processes to raise the standard of skill and efficiency of their workingmen and merchants higher than that of the Germans and Americans, they would still be unable to compete with the latter in the domestic markets of Great Britain, if their rivals persisted in dumping their surplus products into the United Kingdom without any regard to the cost of production. Of course, too, the barriers of a high tariff in the protected countries could not be surmounted by the British working under such disadvantageous conditions. Equally futile would prove the at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempts to overcome the drawbacks under which the United Kingdom now labors by infusing a different spirit into trades unionism. It is probable that the methods of these organizations handicap trade; but it is difficult to perceive that any concessions they might make to employers would prove of substantial value in a contest which every one clearly recognizes is between the normal and the abnormal. In other words, British labor efficiency, no matter how greatly it might be increased, would not prove an offset to the cuts which the manufacturers of protected countries are ready to make in order to prevent their home markets from becoming unprofitable.

There is only one method by which Great Britain may successfully combat the modern tendency. She must resort to the plans of her rivals. There is no difficulty in the way of her doing so except a purely theoretical one. It is not true, as many Cobdenites assume, that a resort to protection would have the result of crippling British industry. That might prove to be the case if the work of constructing a tariff were bunglingly done; but there is no reason why it should be. The adoption of a protective tariff does not call for an assault on the cheap loaf of the workingman, or an attack on raw materials. The United Kingdom may take a hint from American tariff framers, who have learned the art of constructing schedules which scarcely touch the producing classes. There is a Cobdenistic fallacy that the tariff of the United States is an obstacle to production; but it vanishes into thin air when it is examined. Inquiry discloses that the tariff of the United States contains a large free list, and that special pains are taken so to adjust the duties that the payment of them falls on the class best able to bear the tax.

The framers of a British tariff would have a broad field to work in. Nearly the entire amount of manufactured goods now imported into the United Kingdom represents articles consumed by the non-working classes; and it is inconceivable that an enhancement of their price to the British consumer would increase the cost of production of the staple and other manufactures of the British Isles. If the man or woman who wears French gloves is obliged to pay a shilling a pair more for them, the workers in the textile factories and the rolling mills will not suffer in consequence; nor will the latter experience any inconvenience if the British legislator, in his wisdom, sees fit to impose a duty on *pâté de foie gras* and other luxuries consumed by those who neither toil nor spin. The British, who profess to revere the teachings of Adam Smith, ought to know this. He has told them plainly that "taxes upon luxuries have no tendency to raise the price of any other commodities except that of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commodities taxed."[1] They might also profit from an equally pregnant observation by the same writer that

"the advanced price of such manufactures as are real necessaries of life, and are destined for the consumption of the poor—of coarse woollens, for example—must be compensated to the poor by a farther advancement of their wages."

If the British had the courage to act on the sound doctrine these two quotations inculcate, they would promptly find a way out of what is now regarded by many of their publicists as a commercial impasse. The results would be to relieve the greatly overburdened agricultural industry and permit of its expansion. To emphasize the contention that the policy which was adopted in ignorance of the possibilities of competition might be safely reversed now that the event has contradicted the prophecies of Cobden and his followers, it is not necessary to draw on Kropotkin and other advocates of the idea that the British Isles, by resorting to an intensive system of farming, could easily produce enough to maintain an even greater population than that which now inhabits them. If the free traders will take the trouble to turn to the speeches of Cobden and the writings of John Stuart Mill, J. E. Thorold Rogers, and others, they will see that British agriculture was regarded as safe from foreign assault. It has not proved so. Therefore, it is rational now to adopt means for its defence, especially when it is self-evident that the result would be to relieve the burdens of industry and transfer them where they belong.

Chancellors of the Exchequer have had some very difficult budgets to deal with in the past; but the future will present problems which will prove insoluble by ordinary methods. There will have to be a complete change of the incidence of taxation, and a diminution, rather than an increase, of the load borne by the British taxpayer. In a very short time it will be impossible for the British manufacturing industry to bear the burden imposed upon it by the continued expansion of the military and naval programme. Hitherto that important section of the taxpaying class whose incomes have been derived from the profits of trade have been able to meet the Government's exactions; but the signs of the times indicate the approach of a period of unprofitable business, and consequently of shrinking incomes. Such a result cannot be averted if the statesmen of Great Britain persist in the fallacious policy of permitting the United Kingdom to be made the dumping ground for the surplus products of other nations. The increasing dearness of coal and the growing scarcity of iron ores in themselves constitute a sufficient menace to British trade.

[1] "Wealth of Nations," book v., ch. ii.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To accentuate the evils which they produce by exposing the manufacturers and workingmen of the United Kingdom to the kind of competition to which Lord Rosebery and others have drawn attention would prove suicidal.

If Great Britain had the courage to confess that the economic policy she embarked upon is a failure and to stare the situation squarely in the face, many of the difficulties which now confront the British people would disappear as if by magic. A certain class of consumers might take exception to the consequences of the economic awakening; but the industrial and political fate of the nation is by no means dependent upon their fortune or good will. Those to be considered at this juncture are the producers. If affairs are so managed that they may be permitted to continue their useful work, those who live by trade, and their dependents, cannot fail to prosper. But if Great Britain persists in exposing herself to the assaults of commercial rivalry, she must go under. If she elects to defend herself she will solve a difficult problem with comparative ease. By affording the manufacturing and agricultural interests a reasonable degree of protection she will give them new life. The shifting of the incidence of taxation will have the effect of making the conditions of life more passable in the country, and of drawing from the cities a part of the stagnant population the maintenance of which is a public burden; while the manufacturer will have less trouble in making both ends meet.

But more important than anything else that can be mentioned would be the result of this change of policy on the external relations of Great Britain. The Cobdenites have erroneously assumed that their system made for peace. It has not done so. On the contrary, its logical outcome has been aggressiveness. It has been found necessary to extend the British empire to open up new avenues for external trade. This has necessitated an enormous and costly military and naval establishment. If the policy of looking for markets abroad and neglecting those at home is abandoned by Great Britain, she will at once disarm the hostility of her rivals, and she will be able to reduce her army and navy to reasonable proportions. It is not for the defence of the British Isles that the vast sums now annually appropriated under that head are expended. A navy half the present size would more effectually accomplish that object. Half or more of the British expenditure for military purposes is to increase trade; but the simple process of levying a tariff in a manner calculated to protect British industry from the unfair aggressions of foreigners would give the United Kingdom infinitely more trade than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be obtained by such methods; for, as has already been shown, there is a possibility of increasing domestic production to the extent of over a billion dollars annually. If this were done, Great Britain would still hold the premier position as an importing nation, with an immensely greater free list than any other nation by exempting raw materials from the payment of duties.

Such a course would allay rather than arouse foreign resentment. The difficulty experienced in entering a market does not create hostility. It is the invasion of the home market by the foreigner with his wares that produces ill feeling; for it is in the nature of things that men seeking an opportunity for employment should resent being deprived of the chance of finding it by foreign products displacing the domestically produced articles.

In conclusion, if any one thinks it strange that an American protectionist should advise Great Britain to pursue a course the adoption of which would make it difficult if not impossible to market much of the surplus of the manufactured products of the United States, let him bear in mind that the members of the economic school to which the writer belongs firmly believe that the best results can be derived only from a system which reduces waste to a minimum. The greatest of all waste, in the opinion of modern protectionists, is that involved in unnecessary external trading; therefore, they view with equanimity every movement which tends to bring worker and consumer closer together. To manufacture in Great Britain the things consumed by the British people will have that result; hence they look with favor on a policy which they are assured would bring it about.

JOHN P. YOUNG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SECRETS OF TAMMANY'S SUCCESS.

CONSIDERING the instances of proved dishonesty on the part of many of the leaders of Tammany from its inception as a political organization to the present, and the odium under which this remarkable body has so often gone down in defeat, its longevity is a matter of general surprise. Moreover, its habit of regaining power after crushing reverses forms to many a riddle apparently without explanation. In many parts of the United States, and in other quarters of the world where little or nothing is known of the conditions in New York city, the name and exploits of Tammany Hall are more or less familiar. In England, particularly, Tammany is at once a study and a wonder to a multitude not deeply versed in any other feature of American life, political or social. Even New Yorkers, living in daily contact with the forces, influences, and environment that make the Tammany organization, find it difficult to account for its enduring robustness, and for its faculty of restoring itself to a control of the city government in the face of a widespread knowledge of what such a restoration inevitably means. One class of the voters may be mercenary and actuated by the lowest and most selfish interests. But it would be an unwarranted assumption to stigmatize as such the entire voting element supporting Tammany. Beneath all that organization's known record of continued corruption and pretence, there must be intrinsically strong qualities and powerful popular currents to have guaranteed it its virile existence. During its career of over a century, amid violent party and factional excitement, it has outlived the most odious of its series of misdeeds, and it has seen great national parties rise, wax strong, and crumble into nothingness. Thus, parties have succeeded parties, and generation has supplanted generation, but Tammany Hall still prevails, apparently more secure in its hold and mightier than ever before.

Patient research, investigation, and observation reveal the secrets of this strength. In order to show, in the first place, the original sources of its power, and the gradual changes which enabled it to forestall extinction and rise dominant, it will be necessary to pass in review some of the more salient points in its history.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the Tammany Society was founded by William Mooney, on May 12, 1789, it was designed simply as a society whose members were sworn to uphold the Constitution and to preserve the liberties of the country. It was not even a political club. In its membership were men of different political leanings, all united in the general purpose to oppose the introduction of any form of government smacking too much of a monarchy. Its chief functions were to hold "elegant dinners," to provide for imposing parades on the Fourth of July, and to issue patriotic addresses. So determined were Mooney and his associates in their hostility to even the externals of European customs, that, in ridicule of the societies of St. George, St. Andrew, and St. David, they chose the name of Tammany, an Indian chief of some celebrity, as that of their society, and not only adopted Indian titles for the society's officers, but employed the peculiar Indian ceremonials in its rites and parades.

Until about the end of Washington's second administration the Tammany Society was politically an innocuous body. But in the ever-widening controversy between the forces of centralization, represented by Alexander Hamilton, and those standing for decentralization, headed by Thomas Jefferson, the majority of the society's members took sides with Jefferson; the Federalist members either, for the most part, withdrawing or being reduced to an ineffective minority. Had the regulation of the affairs of the society remained solely in the hands of Mooney and his personal associates, it would have been merely a spectacular body, with its singular mimicry of Indian customs, and its issuing of pompous addresses. But a far more ingenious man, one who carefully estimated its latent possibilities and appreciated its capabilities as a power, grasped, though working through others, the real control of the Tammany Society, and saved it from a death from inanition that at one time threatened it. This was Aaron Burr. Under him and his protégés, the society became political, at first seeking to influence voters through social means and pamphlets, and then in 1806–8 instituting a highly effective organization, apparently distinct from the Tammany Society, but in reality a part of it.

The early history alone of Tammany Hall makes a voluminous narrative. A vast amount of space would be required to describe how it succeeded in carrying the city for Jefferson in 1800; how the same city, which always had been distinguished for its Toryism, was brought under its rule; and how, with varying fortunes, it grew so as to become invincible by 1822. I shall merely point out the essential features which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not only contributed to its success then, but which have exercised a deep influence to this very day.

At this distance of time it is very difficult to form a correct understanding of the prejudice, not to say the hatred borne by class toward class in New York city at the close of the eighteenth century. Entrenched within its sphere by all the favoring influences of European and colonial customs and law, there was, on the one side, an aristocratic class that looked with contempt on all beneath it. Not only did it possess its capacious manors, and its special privileges guaranteed by law, but it controlled trade and had a style of dress distinct from that of the common mass of the people. The aristocrat, with his lace ruffles and attractive sky-blue or other colored satin garments, his powdered wig, and his silver-buckled shoes, formed a notable contrast to the meanly-dressed laborer, with his leather breeches. This aristocratic class, described in the Tory journals of the day as "the respectable element," had habitually, with few exceptions, sneered at the Declaration of Independence and the Revolution, made jests of all notions of political equality, and fêted the British officers. To this class belonged those "loyalists" who, after the British evacuation, expatriated themselves to Nova Scotia and other parts, rather than live under the new conditions; while those that remained lost no opportunity, as Dr. John W. Francis tells in his "Reminiscences," of referring superciliously, for decades after, to "the rabble," with whom, in abstract theory at least, they were now on nothing more than an equal footing. But this conception was by no means sustained by the facts. In reality there was no such thing as political, much less social, equality. Some of the best and purest men of the Revolution were permeated by the aristocratic dread of general suffrage, besides being devout believers in the doctrine that the interests of the people were best conserved by placing the voting and administrative powers in the hands of the propertied classes. Hence we find the provisions in the State Constitution of 1777, that only the possessors of actual freeholds to the value of £100, free of all debts, should be allowed to vote for governor, lieutenant-governor, and State senators, and that a vote for the less important office of assemblyman should require the possession of a freehold, in the county, valued at £20, or the payment of forty shillings rent yearly. These provisions remained practically in force until 1822, and were repealed only after the severest agitation.

On the other side were the middle and laboring classes, keenly conscious of their subordinate social, political, and industrial station. They believed that the rich families were not only aiming to retain such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

privileges as they already enjoyed, but were seeking to aggrandize themselves in every possible way. In his campaign speeches and addresses, Alexander Hamilton took special pains to assure the people at large of the baselessness of this charge. Nevertheless, the bitter class feeling formed a line of division, which time, instead of obliterating, only the more accentuated. To this class struggle Tammany owed its first successes; and this identical factor forms the first of the secrets of its series of triumphs.

The rich needed no special body to safeguard their interests in the early part of the century. Law and force of custom, as I have mentioned, tended to do that. Moreover, every person who expected to profit by their patronage and influence was their devoted advocate. The poor, however, felt the want of a defender who could secure them the political and social reforms they demanded. This they found in the Tammany Society, which was composed mainly of poor men or tradesmen. There were at this time various factions in the Republican party — chiefly the "Clintonites," and the "Martling," or Tammany men, so called from Martling's tavern, where their meetings were held. The "Clintonites" were the followers of De Witt Clinton, who, from 1802 to his death, in 1828, fought Tammany unrelentingly. The decrees of the leaders of the Tammany Society were obeyed for some years with scarcely a murmur by the majority of local Republicans, for the reason that it was held to be the incarnation of opposition to the aristocracy; and when, in 1806–8, the popular voice demanded that a voters' organization should be substituted in place of a few self-constituted leaders, the general, correspondence, finance, and nominating committees were formed, in accordance with the general view, first, that the aristocratic element would be best overthrown by a systematic and continuous organization; and, second, that it would place nominating and other political powers more directly in the hands of the voters.

Instead of diminishing in force, this class animosity grew annually. The aristocracy, for the most part, opposed the War of 1812; and, owing to its powerful help, joined with the unpopularity of the Embargo Act and the official dishonesty of a number of Tammany's leaders, the Federalists were enabled more or less to rule the city from 1809 to the end of that war. To the masses, if we may so term them, the aristocracy not only represented a distinct class, but appeared to be inimical to Republican institutions. Thus, in June, 1814, a gathering of Federalists in Washington Hall spoke sneeringly of democracy, and drank toasts to the success of the allied monarchs of Europe over Napoleon. A crowd,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learning the purport of the business, mobbed the hall, and desisted only after twenty of its leaders had been arrested. Again, in 1819, 1820, and 1821 the aristocracy vehemently opposed the proposition of manhood suffrage. Its orators, representatives, and writers passionately assailed the idea, and predicted the general ruin of the community's best interests, should the constitutional amendment be adopted. Ever since the close of the Revolution the property qualifications for voters had been a sore point with the poor; and the manifest unfairness and injustice of these tests rankled in their heads and hearts. A man who had fought all through the Revolution or the War of 1812 was debarred from voting if unable to meet the necessary requirements; while the rich landholder, who in the days of '76 had abetted the British, or in the War of 1812 had tried to paralyze the Government's efforts, was allowed the fullest electoral power. The insulting references constantly made during that agitation to the intelligence of the disfranchised class are amazing to the modern reader. All possible arguments and all available means were employed to defeat the measure; and only after years of effort were its advocates able to achieve success.

Under the new conditions, beginning in 1823 and 1826, when every citizen had the right to vote, Tammany Hall became more than ever the chosen rallying party of the masses. It was so powerful in the city in those years that frequently the remaining Federalists refused to make nominations. Its organization had never been developed outside the city limits, but within them it was in a perfect state of working order and discipline. The Federalists, as a party, were well-nigh disorganized. The scatterings that remained might have had an abundance of money, influential newspapers, gifted orators, and business and social prestige; but they could not muster anything approaching even an imitation of Tammany's superb organization. Not only was the creation of this latter due, as I have mentioned, to the force of popular feeling against the aristocracy, but the very discipline and "boss" rule of Tammany were likewise its direct results. The different ward meetings passed resolution after resolution, on different occasions, in the twenties, vesting the most autocratic powers in the general committee, and declaring for "regular nominations" only, because of the fear that the aristocratic party sought to destroy the Republican party by inciting a variety of nominations and attempting to weaken the organization. In course of time, these autocratic powers became centred in a clique of leaders, finally culminating, in 1867, as a natural evolution, in the supreme leader or "boss."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By the year 1829 a new form of aristocracy had been developed, denounced, in the language of the time, as the "money aristocracy." This was composed of various banking and commercial interests, which had secured, generally by fraudulent means, enormously valuable special privileges at the expense of the community. The feeling against it was so strong that the powerful Workingman's party arose in 1829, advocating reforms of the most radical character. This movement would have attained a more enduring life, had it not been mainly for the fact that all Republicans, or Democrats, as they were now known, joined in supporting Jackson against the United States Bank. Here, again, class bitterness showed itself to a remarkable degree; though the State banks, for interested purposes, sided with Jackson, and hence deprived the campaign of any aspect of rigid class-lines. In 1834 the formidable Equal Rights party, based upon much the same lines as the Workingmen's party, arose, and warred upon both the Whigs and Tammany Hall; though the greater part of its men were Tammany voters, who had at first tried to effect reform inside the organization. For, however perennial Tammany resolutions might declaim against the money aristocracy, its chiefs were a part of that aristocracy. Nearly every one of the thirty-six members of the general committee was a president or director of some corporation enjoying great legal powers; and nearly every prominent Tammany man had voted or lobbied for measures creating banks or other corporations — measures evoking great popular criticism and discontent. It was not until the Equal Rights party had demonstrated its ability to defeat Tammany in a three-cornered contest, with much agitation and a riot or two, that the masses inside the Tammany organization seized the reins of power from their self-seeking leaders, and adopted a satisfactory plan of reforms. Its advocacy of Van Buren's sub-treasury scheme caused the State-bank owners to withdraw from the Hall in 1837. In 1840 it became known more than ever as distinctively "the champion of the poor," as in that year the very lowest classes obtained supremacy, and the ward heelers began to overrun and rule the organization.

Here, then, is the first of the secrets of Tammany's success: its sympathy and stand for the common people and its working with them. Its resolutions against aristocracy read the same, excepting slight differences in diction, in the year 1898 as they did in the year 1800. Tammany's leaders stole from the city, State, and general government; and they constantly imposed such misgovernment as would have wrecked a dozen times over a city of less fabulous resources. Nevertheless, despite the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duplicity of its leaders, the Hall has ever stood before the poor as their friend. In 1824 the general committee fulminated thus against Clinton:

"He is haughty in his manners and a friend of the aristocracy — cold and distant to all who cannot boast of wealth and family distinctions, and selfish in all the ends he aims at."

In 1868, the general committee, of which Tweed was the head, announced, in advocating the election of John T. Hoffman as Governor:

" . . . He is the friend of the poor, the sympathizer with the naturalized citizen, and the foe to all municipal oppression in the form of all odious and other excise requisitional laws. . . . Is not the pending contest preëminently one of capital against labor, of money against popular rights, and of political power against the struggling interests of the masses?"

In 1898, Senator Grady harangued violently in Tammany Hall against the aristocracy, and resolutions passed by the organization that year had a similar substance.

I have chosen here instances, at widely separated intervals, showing the intensity of class feeling and prejudice from before the formation of the Government itself to the present day, and the tactical advantage that Tammany has enjoyed in posing before the multitude as its defender. If this feeling was conspicuous before 1840, it has become more so since, with the tremendous influx of poverty-stricken immigrants, which, beginning about the year 1846, has continued in fluctuating force. The struggle for a livelihood has increased in intensity, and nowhere in America is there another city of such sharp economic contrasts as New York. It cannot be denied that great numbers of the voters, while knowing the methods of Tammany, are, nevertheless, firm in their belief that the elements opposed to Tammany Hall are, for the most part, far more sinister in their refinement of corruption and pretensions of superiority. They admit Tammany's unenviable record; yet they insist that many of the "reformers," whose paramount conception of reform is to war on the petty evidences of corruption, are men who, themselves or through agents, have been the instigators of those more dangerous modes of corruption which have debauched legislative and aldermanic bodies into conferring on them special privileges of such magnitude that their value, expressed in adequate money terms, would seem stupendous. Thousands upon thousands of voters would prefer to support a real reform movement, seeking to remedy, however gradually, the actual civic and industrial conditions. When such an alternative is not presented, they choose to cast their ballots for Tammany; believing that, whatever its corrup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, it does not represent such an ultimate power for evil as many of its opponents do.

While this class feeling has contributed to Tammany's permanency and its recurrent restoration to power, it has not been the sole factor by any means. It always gave Tammany a certain popular support apart from the enrolled members of the organization committees. Very often this support has meant victory; but there have been times when Tammany's extremely unpalatable administration alienated a potent part of its supporters and brought its dismissal from power. But such defections were those of that independent fringe of voters who generally side with Tammany, and not those of the tens of thousands who vote for the "regular" Tammany ticket, year in, year out. This independent vote is a well-known factor in local politics; and it is periodically swollen by disgruntled Tammany men who have failed in some ulterior object. The independents have so often proved their ability to hold the balance of power that Tammany Hall makes the greatest effort to retain their goodwill; knowing that it can depend upon a large following otherwise from class feeling and the necessities of its army of office-holders or seekers. The blunders of the "reformers" have invariably estranged these independents after a short time; the consequence being that, joined with the vote of its class followers and organization men, Tammany has been able, after a brief exile from office, to return triumphantly to the spoils.

Upon class feeling, therefore, all the various activities of Tammany Hall have been, and are, built. The other secrets of its success are methods and plans of action. Underlying these is that sagacity of its leaders which, at critical moments, has not only averted defeat, but distinctively strengthened Tammany Hall.

In the early part of the nineteenth century Tammany was a non-Catholic, non-foreign body. Not only did the extreme prejudice against the holding of office by Catholics and foreigners cause it to nominate exclusively Protestants and natives, but a foreigner was not even allowed to hold an important post in the Tammany Society. But Tammany was remarkably adaptive, generally responding to every public influence that would yield it success. As immigration increased year by year, and foreigners and Catholics became a more telling power politically and socially, Tammany, with much adroitness, made timely concessions by nominating them for minor offices. And when, by the introduction of manhood suffrage, the electorate was greatly increased, Tammany became professedly the friend of the immigrant. While the Federalists and Whigs abused him and did their best to minimize his efforts in politics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tammany, through its organization committees, took him in charge, made his path to naturalization as facile a process as possible, gave him a small or important "job," according to the nature of his influence over his fellows, and altogether impressed him with the idea that, by being a Tammany man, he stood an excellent chance in life. This attachment was riveted by the course of the violently anti-Catholic, anti-foreign, Native American party of 1844–45 and 1854. Thus Tammany secured the lasting fidelity of a large and steadily growing class, which, unacquainted with the problems confronting the native voters, understood only that Tammany Hall did not antagonize it, and that Tammany, whatever its faults, represented, and was good to, the poor. How powerful this class became may be judged from the following figures: In 1855, the native voters in the city numbered 46,173 and the aliens 42,704; ten years later, the State census gave the city 51,500 native and 77,475 naturalized voters. Though there was some doubt as to the correctness of the latter census, the returns of naturalized citizens, swollen as they were to permit fraudulent registration, were significant of the great strength of the alien vote. It stood quite solidly by Tammany in the days of the most flagrant corruption, and formed a phalanx which could always be relied upon.

As Tammany dealt with this particular movement, so did it deal with other movements. Nothing could exceed its *finesse*, after the War of 1812, in breaking up the rapidly disintegrating Federalist party by giving the most important offices at its disposal to able Federalists disgusted with the anti-war policy of their party. Nearly every opposing party or faction down to the present day has been dealt with on the same line or similar lines whenever possible. More modern instances can be mentioned in the County Democracy of 1880–1887, the labor movement of 1887, and the factional parties combating it between 1894 and 1897. Many of the leaders of these were gradually won over with gifts of nominations for, or appointments to, high offices. In fact, so consistently has Tammany Hall pursued this systematic policy of dissolving rival organizations, that it has been a time-honored axiom in local politics that the surest way to obtain a most respectful recognition by Tammany is to start a counter Democratic organization. The more formidable it appears the higher will be the reward.

It is needless to say, however, that all the various parties opposed to Tammany, from the year 1800, have not been broken by such means. The exigencies of National politics alone, not to speak of the principles involved, have always played a very considerable part in local politics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and have kept alive a party struggle based upon more than the spoils. State issues, also, have affected the political cast of the city. Such being the case, Tammany's resources have been various and most cleverly applied. Its chiefs refrained from actively supporting the manhood suffrage agitation until the public voice in the entire State for the change grew unmistakably strong; and then, with great enthusiasm, they thrust themselves forward as its leaders. They resisted De Witt Clinton's policy of internal improvements until they realized its overshadowing popularity, when they suddenly favored giving for that object so large an appropriation as to make Tammany Hall appear a better friend of State canals than Clinton himself. Tammany could not buy off the sincere leaders of the Workingmen's party in 1829, but it drew off that party's support by championing some of the measures loudly demanded, and thus on through many instances. In other crises, when the opposition proved unusually strong, Tammany's leaders played the game so well that the opposition, instead of combining against the Wigwam, were split into separate, independent parties at war over some National question of principle, or some local question of expediency; the inevitable result being that Tammany, with its compact organization, won again and again. Without recalling occasions in the remote past the local campaign of 1897 may be noticed. Had the Citizens' Union and the Republican party combined on candidates, they would have had a clear majority of all the votes. The reasons for their not forming this combination will not be set forth here; but some of the facts, as privately told, form an interesting chapter in the story of the superior crafty handiwork of Tammany's chiefs.

A more momentous question with which Tammany has now and then had to grapple has been the almost equal division of the city's Democratic voters in contending organizations; for one of the main pillars of the Wigwam's strength lies in its pretensions to represent the National Democratic party locally. This phase operates to bring to its support a body of voters not connected with its organization, but voting, solely out of party considerations, the "regular Democratic ticket" it presents. When a great rival Democratic organization — not a mere personal faction — arises, then the problem assumes a most serious phase. This was especially so from 1880 to 1886, when the County Democracy gathered to itself about one-half the local Democratic voters. In the campaign of 1886, Tammany's "boss," Mr. Croker, made a brilliant flank move by choosing, as Tammany's selection for mayor, Mr. Abram S. Hewitt, the County Democracy's candidate; thus allying the two organizations for the time, and preventing by this and other means the election of Henry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

George. Later, the County Democracy was completely wiped out by some of the means heretofore indicated.

This constant display of sagacity has been reënforced by other energies. When necessary and possible, Tammany has not failed to resort to ballot-box stuffing, the bribing of voters, and fraudulent naturalizations and canvassing. The specific instances of these are so numerous and so thoroughly matters of record that an enumeration would be superfluous. The other parties have not been above these practices, by any means; the difference having been simply one of degree and opportunity.

Lastly, and in order of importance, comes the matter of organization. Tammany was the first of all political voting bodies to learn that organization means unity and system; carrying with it the strongest possibilities of contributing to consecutive successes. That lesson has been widely diffused; but nowhere else in the world is there such a perfect piece of political mechanism as Tammany Hall. The reason is twofold.

First, there is the Tammany Society, which antedates the organization, and from the year 1811 has owned its own building. The question of quarters, therefore, has never been a disturbing problem. Other parties and factions, born in the enthusiasm of the moment or times, have found the matter of a central headquarters a serious proposition. A few individual leaders have grown tired of supplying funds and of meeting other contingent expenses. The Republican party, it is true, has its local, central meeting-place; but this cannot be compared to the Tammany Hall building, with its many facilities for political action. Moreover, Tammany Hall has its traditions of Democracy; and the poorest voter knows that it has been the rallying centre of the masses from time out of mind. The possession of its building has been of tremendous advantage in elaborating the organization. Not only has convention after convention been held there, but political committees or bodies could meet there every night in the year, if necessary. The value of this desideratum alone will be apparent when it is recalled that Tammany has passed through some very adverse times, with either a low exchequer or an empty one.

The other reason is the character of the organization itself. From the time of its inception, in 1806–8, it has been self-perpetuating. Originally, the voters in each ward chose a ward committee of three, the ward committee constituting a general committee, which had the power of convening all public meetings of the party and of making preparatory arrangements for the approaching elections. The size of the general committee increased with the number of wards, and in 1843

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was further enlarged by being based on the election precinct instead of the ward. Still further increases were made during and since 1873. This Tammany Hall general committee now includes over 5,000 members. The action of the general committee was backed by the correspondence, finance, and nominating committees. The latter was composed of seven delegates from each ward, and was the predecessor of the modern nominating convention. These committees were elected for one year; and no sooner did they step out than their successors took their places.

Here was a superb organization, moving, year after year and day after day, with a unity, consistency, and effective system unknown before in politics. Through this machinery every party voter was reached. The general committee knew to a nicety how many votes could be depended upon, how many were doubtful, and how many hostile; and it could take measures accordingly. At first the solidarity of the organization was insured by the popular feeling, already described, that it was necessary to combine against the designs of the aristocratic party by self-interest in the form of the expectation or retention of the spoils. Subsequently — since about 1840 — the latter consideration became the all-dominant one. In contrast to this cohesive organization, the Federalists met only sporadically at banquets, and relied upon the power of their money and superior position in society; though the Whigs did adopt a weak imitation of Tammany's organization in the thirties and forties. But at no time has there been anything approaching a permanent duplication of the Wigwam's "machine."

Where, before Tweed's time, Tammany's affairs had been administered by a clique of leaders, Tweed managed to concentrate almost absolute power in himself, by controlling the general and the other committees and the Tammany Society. As Grand Sachem of the latter, he could turn out of the Tammany Hall building any faction disputing his sway; and, though that faction might later make nominations, it would lack the prestige of "regularity." With Tweed, then, began the absolute "boss" dynasty; the present representative being, it need hardly be said, Richard Croker.

The Tammany organization of to-day is developed to a high pitch of political perfection. Every one of the thirty-six assembly districts in the Boroughs of the Manhattan and the Bronx has its leader, and each of the 892 election districts its captain. All the voters can be reached in a house-to-house canvass within twenty-four hours, if necessary. There are standing committees on finance, printing, correspondence, nat-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uralization, and organization, each of which thoroughly does the duty assigned to it. The general committee meets monthly, and once a year goes through the form of holding a county convention. It is through the executive committee, however, composed generally of the district leaders, that the "Boss" issues his decrees. Above all, Tammany is never at a loss for funds. All Tammany office-holders and many other city employés are expected to contribute. The annual fund from this source alone may be conjectured when it is stated that the city now has about 60,000 employés. All candidates for office are assessed heavily. Gambling-houses, pool-rooms, saloons, and other places also contribute lavishly, as well as corporations of all kinds, and individuals who find it convenient not to incur the hostility of the ruling powers.

In addition, the Tammany Hall organization is made more effective by its social activity. It admirably adapts itself to the environment of each neighborhood, and comes into direct touch with the people. Its leaders give annual dinners to the poor of their districts; they get this or that man out of trouble; if a poor widow is in danger of being dispossessed her case is seen to; "jobs" are distributed; entertainments are held for the benefit of struggling churches; and a thousand and one other varieties of assistance are rendered to the needy. All this, of course, is done selfishly, with a view to strengthening the leader and the organization in the districts, and much of the money used comes from sources that would not bear investigation; but the simple fact of its being done affects powerfully certain classes of voters. This element of human sympathy has more effect with them than all the lofty manifestoes issued by committees or bodies with whom they never come in such personal contact.

GUSTAVUS MYERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POE FIFTY YEARS AFTER.

In the history of American authors there has probably not been a life of more pathetic interest than that of Edgar Allan Poe. Indeed, misfortune seems to have pursued him to his grave; and even after his death his memory was unmercifully traduced. Griswold's spiteful and vicious attack in the memoir prefixed to his edition of Poe's works set the fashion, which, except in rare instances, has been followed somewhat blindly. But here and there a few brave writers have dared to offer a word in defence, and to state the facts, even at the risk of being voted biassed and narrow of view. Some essayists, however, emboldened by these sporadic efforts, have recoiled to the other extreme, and by their unbounded admiration of everything that came from Poe's pen have done his cause quite as much harm as those who shamefully defame him. Needless to say, somewhere between these two extremes lies the region of truth. Wholesome advice is contained in the maxim *Ne quid nimis;* and this motto will furnish us a safe guide in literary as well as in political controversies.

It is wellnigh impossible to give a just and correct estimate of an author either during his life or immediately after his death. Proximity to a beautiful landscape distorts our view, and prevents our receiving a correct and adequate impression of its beauty. We must get the proper perspective and view the landscape from a point not too near, on the one hand, or too remote, on the other. Surely, then, after the lapse of half a century we may turn our glass upon Poe, in the hope of obtaining a fairer and more adequate view of the author's genius than was possible on the part of his contemporaries.

Poe's detractors have indicted him on the charge of gross immorality. To be more specific, they have said that he was an habitual drunkard, an ingrate, a scoffer, and a libertine. Now, it is not the purpose of this paper to defend Poe against the charge of occasional drunkenness. Not even his most ardent admirers, unless so utterly biassed as to be incapable of appreciating an established fact, would, I fancy, attempt to exonerate him from this accusation. But, while it is true that Poe indulged

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all too freely his convivial passion, it is equally true that he endeavored to abstain, and that he actually did abstain, from such indulgence sometimes for several months in succession. Like many others, however, he had been reared in a household where liberal potations seem to have been encouraged, or, at all events, not forbidden. Poe, unfortunately, inherited from his parents, who were stage people, a lack of self-control; and it was against this inherited weakness and deficiency in will-power that he fought with varying success and failure all his mature years, until at last he yielded and sank down in utter despair.

Little need be said in reply to the other specific charges. The conviction has grown upon me, after a careful study of his life and works, that, although at times he seemed to show but scant appreciation of the kindnesses bestowed upon him by some of his friends, Poe nevertheless was not an ingrate. He had many friends, who, when after his death an attempt was made by his enemies to plant thorns upon his grave, interposed and themselves planted roses there. I do not believe Poe was a scoffer. Nor, on the other hand, do I think that he had any deep and abiding religious convictions, or that he ever drew much comfort from his religion. In reference to the last count in the indictment, I feel, after reading Professor Woodberry's biography, that few men have ever proved more devoted and faithful husbands than did Poe to his beautiful but frail Virginia. Upon the evidence of Mrs. Clemm, Poe's mother-in-law, his conjugal relations were entirely free from every discordant element; and his untiring devotion to his wife in her last lingering illness was as beautiful as it was pathetic. Moreover, there is not the slightest suggestion of immorality in any poem or story which Poe wrote. His works are as chaste as an icicle. This is far more than can be said of much of our present-day fiction.

Poe's genius may be considered in a threefold aspect. He may be regarded as a critic, as a poet, and as a romancer. In each of these realms Poe attained to eminence; but it is only in the last two aspects that I wish especially to consider him now. I need hardly say that I do not intend by this to imply any disparagement of his critical genius. On the contrary, Poe, in my judgment, is rightly entitled to the distinction of being the first American man of letters to write criticism deserving the name. Before his advent into journalism criticism had been but little better than fulsome flattery. After his appearance journalistic criticism entered upon a new era. His reviews, though frequently drastic, and sometimes, it must be admitted, inspired by personal prejudice, had, nevertheless, a wholesome and stimulating effect upon American author-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship. His "Marginalia" awakened a sense of injustice and resentment in the breasts of the more virile, and struck sheer terror to the hearts of the weaklings. Mr. Stedman justly calls his sketches "a prose Dunciad, waspish and unfair, yet not without touches of magnanimity." It has been truly observed that whenever Poe, unbiassed by personal motives, pronounced favorably upon the talents of an author, such as Bayard Taylor, Mrs. Browning, or Tennyson, his judgments have been sustained by the verdict of the present generation. But his prejudice made him merciless and unrelenting to the New England poets, as a class. According to his view nothing good or beautiful could come out of the Nazareth of Boston. It need hardly be remarked that the present generation has, in many instances, reversed Poe's critical dicta.

But enough of Poe as a critic. Let us now take up his poetry. In his masterly essay on Thomas Gray, Matthew Arnold says of that writer that his whole history as a poet is contained in a remark, made by an appreciative friend, to the effect that "he never spoke out in poetry." The same remark is equally applicable to Poe; for it is a common feeling, shared alike by the present generation and by his contemporaries, that he never really gave complete utterance to the poetry which kindled his imagination and stirred his soul.

Poe was not a prolific writer. All the poetry that he ever published could be pressed between the covers of a very slender book. But volume is not the only, or even the main, criterion in determining the standing of a poet. Indeed, it is rather an insignificant factor. In the determination of a poet's standing, spontaneity and passion, not volume, are the criteria. "Poetry," says Poe, in the preface to his juvenile productions, "has been with me a passion, not a purpose." Still, we heartily wish that he had written more of purpose, though no less of passion.

It must be conceded that Poe's range of subject — his register, to borrow a musical term — was quite narrow. In his youth, as a critic has observed, he struck the key-notes of a few themes; and the output of his mature years was but a variation on these. The death, in his youth, of a lady to whom he was devoted made a profound impression upon his susceptible heart, and filled his soul with a poignant feeling of sadness and of longing for one far removed from human companionship and beyond recall. This henceforth was to be the inspiration of his genius and the burden of his song. Says Mr. Edmund Gosse, the eminent English critic, himself no mean poet: "If Poe had not harped so persistently on his one theme of remorseful passion for the irrevocable dead, if he had employed his extraordinary, his unparalleled gifts of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

melodious invention, with equal skill, in illustrating a variety of themes, he must have been with the greatest poets."

Poe's best-known poems, those upon which his fame as a poet rests, are "The Raven," first of all, "The Bells," "For Annie," "Ulalume," "The City in the Sea," "The Haunted Palace," and "The Conqueror Worm." Of these "The Raven," written in 1845, is by far the most widely known, and deservedly the most popular. With its publication Poe, like Byron with the publication of "Childe Harold," leaped immediately into fame. His manuscript articles which, up to this time, editors had kept in dark pigeon-holes were now brought to the light of day, and were greatly in request; and enterprising magazines were eager to announce, as a special attraction, a new poem by the author of "The Raven." The instant success of this production provoked a new edition of Poe's writings, which appeared toward the end of the year 1845, under the title, "The Raven and Other Poems." This volume contained wellnigh all the verse Poe had ever written. The early poems had undergone alterations more or less slight, in accordance with the author's fashion of recasting and republishing his early work as if it were appearing for the first time.

In view of the popularity of "The Raven" and of its importance as being Poe's greatest poem, it will not be out of place to linger over it for a while and notice it somewhat in detail. In his "Philosophy of Composition," Poe gives a detailed account of his method of composing "The Raven" and of its *motif;* and the story has such a *vraisemblance* and such a positiveness about it as almost to compel belief. Moreover, the author's peculiar views, which he set forth elsewhere, in respect of the poetic principle are involved in the account; and he uses "The Raven" to illustrate his theory as to the aim and scope of poetry.

Poe believed, with Coleridge, that the pleasure arising from the contemplation of beauty is keener, more chaste, and more elevating to the soul than that which springs from the contemplation of truth by the mere intellect, or even than that which springs from any passion of the heart. He maintained, further, that it is through this sentiment of beauty that man acquires his clearest conceptions of eternal nature, and is consequently brought into closest touch with the divine. This subtle power exists in the beauty of nature, which inspires man with a belief in something beyond nature, fairer and more beautiful still, to be discerned only by the imagination. It is the province of art to fashion this ideal beauty for the gratification of man's spiritual emotion. This is the end and aim of all the fine arts, but more especially of the crown-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing arts of music and poetry. The incitements of passion, the precepts of duty, and even the lessons of truth are included; but they must be subordinated to the main point of the contemplation of beauty. It follows, therefore, that beauty is the sole legitimate theme of poetry; and so Poe defined poetry as "the rhythmical creation of beauty."

However, Poe in his definition did not take the term beauty in its widest and broadest sense, which would include all truth, emotion, and ethics. On the contrary, he restricted the term to what he was pleased to call supernal beauty, that is, the domain of sadness and regret. He regarded a beautiful woman as the very quintessence of beauty, and the death of such a woman as the most poetical theme in the world. This is the *motif* and inspiration of "The Raven." On the general principle that vice can never be beautiful, of course nothing base or degrading could legitimately fall within the province of poetry.

As a minor consideration Poe insisted that, from the very nature of our mental constitution, it is necessary that a poem be brief and aim at a single artistic effect, since the undivided attention cannot be held for several consecutive hours by one subject. This canon, however, was inspired by Schlegel's dictum of the unity or totality of interest. Such a long poem as the "Iliad," the "Odyssey," or "Paradise Lost," according to Poe's theory, depends for its interest and effect upon the various briefer incidents or poems which go to make it up. When we read a poem of great length the attention naturally relaxes at intervals; and, since the interest is not sustained throughout, the poem fails to produce a single artistic effect. Furthermore, Poe maintained that, in order for a poem to produce a characteristic effect, it should possess a distinct rhythm or metre, together with a certain grotesqueness of conception and quaintness of language. Now, all these conditions, Poe claimed, were met in "The Raven" in particular, and in his other poems in general. For in the former we find as the *motif* of the poem the death of a beautiful woman, Lenore; the unique refrain "Nevermore;" a certain grotesqueness of conception in the setting; and an air of quaintness about the language.

Like Lanier, another Southern singer whose career offers almost as many pathetic incidents, Poe was endowed by nature with a keen appreciation of rhythm and music. He was preëminently a melodist; and, what is more, the melody of his verse has not been equalled in the history of American literature, and is not surpassed by any British poet. But, as has been already stated, his register was not wide. Within a limited range he could and did achieve remarkable results, as in the re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frain of "The Bells" or "The Raven." The musical effect of the ballad of either of these poems was, up to the time of their publication, unequalled, and it has not been surpassed since. Poe, with a few choice words, like Paganini with his simple violin, produced a spell which was truly marvellous. It is said of the great musician that such was his control of his instrument, and such his perfection of technique, that in every part of musical Europe even with his very first notes he held vast audiences spell-bound. It may be said of Poe that such was his intuitive sense of beauty, and such the melody of his verse, that he arrested the reluctant attention of the reading public of the two English-speaking nations, and by his haunting music cast a glamour over their poets which none of them, after repeated efforts, has ever since succeeded in reproducing. Mr. Gosse tells us that Poe has proved himself to be the Piper of Hamelin to all later English poets, of whom there is hardly one whose verse music does not show traces of his influence. Surely, it is no small distinction thus to have stamped the impress of one's own genius for melodious verse upon the succeeding generation of English poets, and that, too, of the Victorian era.

Poe is sometimes called a poet of one poem; and the criticism is not altogether unjust. For to the world at large he is generally known as the author of "The Raven." I think Mr. Stedman comes nearer the truth, however, when in an epigrammatic sentence he says: "Poe was not a single-poem poet, but a poet of a single mood." The theme is the same in almost all his poems, namely, ruin. This is the burden of his song; this is the one poetic subject that always kindled his imagination. To be sure, the treatment varies, as might be expected; but the inspiration of his poetry is almost invariably drawn from this one source. "Israfel" furnishes an exception, but it is an exception which proves the rule.

This is Poe's greatest limitation; and a serious limitation it certainly is. It undermines the foundation of his claim to being regarded a great poet, in the sense that English poets like Milton, Dryden, Byron, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and many others that might be named are entitled to rank as great poets. Poe, in my judgment, is an artist in verse; a great artist, indeed, but hardly a great poet. It is true that he possesses "originality in the treatment of themes, perennial charm, exquisite finish in execution, and distinction of individual manner" — elements of poetical greatness as set forth by an eminent English essayist and critic—but he lacks, it seems to me, one of the qualifications needed to entitle him to rank with the great poets. His fatal defect is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his narrowness of range. "The Raven" may wing its ceaseless flight through anthologies, and be admired by generations yet unborn; but this alone does not make its author a great poet any more than the "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard" entitles Gray to rank with the world's great poets. However, although this Southern poet may fail of the distinction of being entitled to rest in the Valhalla of the world's great poets, yet, in my opinion, he justly deserves to rank with the greatest American poets, if, indeed, he is not the very greatest among them.

But it is time for us to consider our author in the aspect of romance. Dearly as he loved it, poetry was never a serious purpose with Poe, as he himself informed the reading public in his youthful preface. It was upon his prose romance and his critical work that he relied to establish his fame. Upon these he was willing to stake his claim to immortality. It ought to be remarked here, however, that it was more especially in the province of romance that he exhibited, in the highest degree, his intellectual force — his vigorous imagination and his acute analytical powers. He has handed down his name to the present generation as the founder of the school of writers, now so popular, who practise the short story. He also deserves the distinction of being the founder of the modern detective story and the modern sea story. Dr. A. Conan Doyle, whether he acknowledges it or not, must be classed as a disciple of Poe; for his "Adventures of Sherlock Holmes" is but the method of Poe carried to its logical conclusion.

Poe's power developed early. Indeed, his genius may be called precocious. Some of his early stories were among his best, and were hardly surpassed in his mature years. His earliest effort, "A MS. Found in a Bottle," exhibits practically the same distinctive qualities as appear in the flower of his work. The difference is one of degree, not of kind. That was a suggestive comment made by Kennedy, to whom young Poe submitted his maiden manuscript: "The young fellow is highly imaginative, and a little given to the terrific." And the criticism is just; for there is no story written by Poe which is not more or less grotesque, and which does not give unmistakable evidence of the author's rare gift of imagination.

His stories naturally divide themselves into two classes: first, the analytical tales, dealing with the grotesque and the terrible; and, secondly, the speculative tales, dealing with the weird and the supernatural. Examples of the former class are "The Black Cat," "The Gold-Bug," "The Tell-tale Heart," and "The Murders in the Rue Morgue;" examples of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the latter are "The Fall of the House of Usher," "Ligeia," "A Tale of the Ragged Mountains," and "William Wilson." The latter class constitutes the author's earlier work in fiction. In the tales of this class Poe gradually worked up to a *dénouement* through a complicated series of facts and incidents. In the tales of the former group, starting with the *dénouement*, he gradually unravelled the plot by his ratiocinative method until he worked his way, incident by incident, back to the very beginning. The end aimed at is different, as well as the starting-point. In the imaginative group it is the emotional element which is emphasized; whereas in the ratiocinative group the solution of the mystery is all important, and the attention is accordingly focussed upon the incidents leading up to this mystery. In both classes of tales Poe showed his inventive genius, his rare imagination, and his subtle artistic power in the selection and in the grouping of the facts — this last especially in the ratiocinative tales.

The following paragraph is interesting as setting forth in the author's own words the aim which he sought and the method which he followed in the construction of his tales:

"A skilful literary artist has constructed a tale. If wise, he has not fashioned his thoughts to accommodate his incidents; but having conceived, with deliberate care, a certain unique or single *effect* to be wrought out, he then invents such incidents — he then combines such events as may best aid him in establishing this preconceived effect. If his very initial sentence tend not to the out-bringing of this effect, then he has failed in his first step. In the whole composition there should be no word written, of which the tendency, direct or indirect, is not to the one preestablished design. And by such means, with such care and skill, a picture is at length painted which leaves in the mind of him who contemplates it, with a kindred art, a sense of the fullest satisfaction. The idea of the tale has been presented unblemished, because undisturbed; and this is an end unattainable by the novel."

In all Poe's stories, subtly conceived and cleverly and exquisitely executed as some of them incontestably are, there is no one character that has taken hold of the affections or that really lives. Poe never painted a single live character. Though a consummate artist, he yet lacked that subtle power of characterization which Thackeray exhibited, in so eminent a degree, in the creation of his immortal Becky Sharp, and Dickens in the creation of his equally famous Sam Weller. These characters are as well known as if they had been real flesh and blood, and will doubtless continue to live in the affections of the people as long as English literature lives. But we search in vain in Poe's fiction for any counterpart to the tactful, impudent Becky Sharp or the resourceful Sam Weller. We find nothing in Poe that even remotely approaches either

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these famous characters. His men and women are as cold as marble, and about as destitute of feeling. They do not appeal to the sympathies; they do not touch the heart. They are clever sketches, faultlessly drawn; but they are, after all, simply "ingenious studies in black and white." Pygmalion so loved Galatea, the beautiful creation of his chisel, that the gods inspired the cold marble with life, to satisfy the prayerful yearning of the artist's heart. But Poe never had any deep reverence or tender feeling for any of the cold, soulless creations of his genius. It is said that some novelists have wept when they have killed the heroes of their own invention. Poe was not of these. He did not hesitate to alter and make over again any of his uninspired, lifeless characters, or even to reduce Deity itself — as in "Eureka" — to a mere mathematical formula. Poe's men and women were conceived in the head, not in the heart, and born of the intellect; consequently they had no warmth of feeling, no soul. This fatal defect in characterization is due, in large measure, to Poe's woeful lack of human sympathy and his utter lack of humor. In no other part of his writings did he make such a signal, glaring failure as in his humorous tales.

Moreover, Poe did not know how to combine people and situations in ordinary life. He could paint one character only at a time. He never learned the art of painting from life, and never succeeded in portraying characters in their interplay upon one another. Indeed, when he painted he took his models not from real life, but from his own imagination. He was the victim of his own over-developed fancy. Here is the weak spot in Poe's artistic equipment. His imagination was abnormally developed, and he lacked the will-power to control and direct it. It was this abnormal imagination that gave color and direction to all he ever achieved, not only in fiction, but also in actual life. It was the promptings of his imagination that he followed when, in his effort to throw men and women upon the canvas, he projected morbid persons like himself, not robust, healthy characters. He could, it is true, invent single situations that resembled those of actual life; but he could not follow these up in a natural sequence. In short, he was a romancer, not a novelist. I believe, with Mr. Stedman, that Poe could never have written a novel.

Yet, despite the limitations of his tales Poe was an entertaining, a charming romancer withal. Of his sixty tales or prose narratives it will be found, when they are sifted, that only about a third deserve to live. But these will live; and they have already won for their author, abroad as well as at home, a fame which, perhaps, no other American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has excelled. By his intellectual characteristics he seems to have appealed to the French reading public with special force. Indeed, the French were the first foreigners to discover his star, which they hailed with characteristic delight — a star whose light, after more than half a century, shows no sign of waning brilliance. It appears from the biography appended to the definitive edition of Poe by Messrs. Stedman and Woodberry that between 1890 and 1895 there were made at least ten translations of his works into various foreign languages. What can have brought about such a remarkable result? In a word, it must be Poe's unique genius — his intense originality, which has hardly been paralleled in literary history, and his indefinable, inimitable charm of manner, which appeals not simply to men of one particular clime or country, but to all men everywhere.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WRITERS IN THE JUNE FORUM.

MR. KARL BLIND, born at Mannheim, Germany, Sept. 4, 1826, was educated at Heidelberg and Bonn universities. Active for German union and freedom, was imprisoned in Bavaria and Baden before the Revolution of 1848, in which he took a leading part, at Karlsruhe. After participating in the Republican rising led by Hecker, was arrested at Strasburg on a false charge of being implicated in the Paris insurrection in June, and was transported to Switzerland. Was leader of the second Republican rising in the Black Forest, and fought at Staufen. A prisoner of war, and court-martialled, his life was saved by the secret sympathy of two members of the Court. After eight months' captivity was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment, but was liberated by the people and the army who overthrew the Grand-ducal government in 1849. Was member of the Embassy at Paris of the Democratic Governments of Baden and Rhenish Palatinate. Was arrested, under Louis Napoleon, in violation of the law of nations, after the overthrow of Ledru-Rollin's rising for the protection of the Roman Republic, and proscribed from France. Carried on a Democratic and National propaganda from England. Coöperated with Garibaldi, Mazzini, and other European leaders. Has published numerous essays on politics, archæology, history, mythology, philosophy, and ancient German and Norse literature.

PROF. EDWIN W. BOWEN was born in southern Maryland in 1866. In 1889 was graduated with the degree of A.M. from Randolph-Macon College, Virginia. Immediately entered the Johns Hopkins University to take advanced courses in English, Latin, and German, and from this institution received his Ph.D. degree in 1892. Upon his graduation was elected Assistant-Professor of English in the University of Missouri, which position he resigned after a tenure of one year in order to prosecute further his studies in Europe. Spent the following year at the University of Leipzig, pursuing advanced courses in Teutonic philology and literature. In 1894 was elected to the chair of Latin in Randolph-Macon College, his present position. Has published several monographs on English philology, both in European and American journals, and from time to time has contributed essays of a literary character to the magazines.

MR. ABRAHAM CAHAN was born in 1860 near Wilna, Russia. Graduated from the Teachers' Institute of Wilna and taught in a public school. Became implicated in the Nihilist propaganda, and fled for his liberty to Austria; subsequently came to America. In 1896 attracted attention by his "Yekl, a Tale of the New York Ghetto," which work was followed by "The Imported Bridegroom and other stories of the Ghetto." Has contributed stories and sketches to leading American magazines, and is at present connected with the New York "Commercial Advertiser."

MR. HAROLD MARTIN was born in New York in 1870. At the outbreak of the Spanish-American war entered the service of the Associated Press, which he represented in Porto Rico and Cuba. Was also correspondent for "Harper's Weekly" and "Collier's Weekly." Represented the Associated Press in the Philippines from July, 1899, to December, 1900.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. GUSTAVUS MYERS was born in 1874 at Trenton, N. J. Was educated in the public schools of Philadelphia. Later served as reporter and editor on various newspapers in Philadelphia and New York. Is author of "The History of Public Franchises in New York City," published in May, 1900, and "The History of Tammany Hall," issued in January, 1901.

PROF. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, born in Boston, 1847, graduated from Harvard in 1869 and from Harvard Divinity School in 1872. Is D.D. of Yale. Held the pastorate of the First Parish Church, Cambridge, from 1874 to 1880, when he was appointed Parkman Professor of Theology in Harvard Divinity School. Since 1886 has been Plummer Professor of Christian Morals. Is author of "Mornings in the College Chapel," "Short Addresses to Young Men on Personal Religion," and other works.

THE REV. ALDEN WALKER QUIMBY was born near Womelsdorf, Pennsylvania, in 1854, and received his early education in the schools of his mother, father, and maternal grandfather, Walker Stephen, a nonagenarian who taught for half a century. In 1878 the Methodist Episcopal Church called him into its ministry. Holds a pastorate at Berwyn, Pa. Has lectured extensively, and contributed to various magazines.

PROF. PAUL S. REINSCH was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1869. Was educated at the University of Wisconsin, and studied contemporary politics in England, Germany, France, and Italy. Is Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. Has published monographs on the common law in the American colonies and on "French Experience with Representative Government in the West Indies," and a book on "World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century."

MR. ALBERT GARDNER ROBINSON was born in Winchester, Mass., in 1855. On leaving school, entered commercial life. In this he remained for some twenty-five years, until the beginning of the Spanish-American war, in the spring of 1898, when he accepted a position as correspondent for the New York "Evening Post." In that capacity has served in Porto Rico, going out with the earliest detachment of troops, and remaining until after the taking of formal possession, at San Juan; in Cuba, where he watched the initial steps of the government of intervention; in the Philippine Islands; and in South Africa. Has recently returned from a second visit to Cuba, made for the purpose of studying the work of the Cuban convention from the Cuban standpoint.

MR. HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST, a native of New York, is one of the best-known and ablest writers on political subjects at the National capital. For a number of years has occupied an editorial position on the Washington "Post," in charge of the Congressional and political work.

MR. JOHN P. YOUNG is managing editor of the San Francisco "Chronicle," a position he has filled since 1878. On the subject of Protection, has written quite prolifically for the "Chronicle" and other publications. Is the author of an extended paper on the subject of Oriental competition, which was printed as a United States Senate document. Also wrote a monograph on "Bimetallism or Monometallism," which has been widely quoted in and out of Congress. Mr. Young is a native of Pennsylvania, and in his youth attended the public schools in the city of Philadelphia. Embarked on his career of journalism in 1869, at the age of twenty, and has filled every position in the profession from office boy to editor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED